DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 107 122 FL 006 812

AUTHOR Hagiwara, M. P.
TITLE A Triple-Track Program in the Second-Year French Courses: A Pilot Study.
PUB DATE [70]
NOTE 73p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *College Language Programs; Curriculum Design; Curriculum Development; *French; Higher Education; Instructional Materials; *Language Instruction; Measurement Instruments; *Pilot Projects; *Program Descriptions; Second Language Learning; Tables (Data); Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

This is a report of a pilot study conducted by the Department of Romance Languages of the University of Michigan to assess the feasibility of a multiple-track foreign language program for second-year language students. The multiple-track system was used during the winter semester of 1969. Three types of French classes were offered. One type was engaged in the "normal" language teaching activities of the second-year courses. The other two emphasized oral French and reading respectively while de-emphasizing the other language skills. This report describes the procedures and materials used in the pilot experiment, measurement techniques, and teacher and student selection. Results of the study are summarized, and recommendations are made concerning program materials and teaching methods. In general, the results of the pilot experiment were viewed as encouraging in that the posttest performance of students indicated no significant differences among the three tracks. The experimental courses were well received by most students who participated, and the multiple-track French program seemed to create needed curricular flexibility in second-year courses. Extensive statistical data are appended. (PMP)

ED107122

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A TRIPLE-TRACK PROGRAM IN THE SECOND-YEAR FRENCH COURSES: A PILOT STUDY

M. P. Hagiwara

FL 006 812

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I:	INTRODUCTION	1
II:	DESCRIPTION OF THE PILOT STUDY	3
	1. Instructional Procedures and Materials	3
	2. Instruments for Measurement	6
	3. Teacher Selection	9
	4. Student Selection	10
III:	RESULTS OF THE STUDY	13
	1. Pretests	13
	2. Main Instructional Activities	14
	3. Posttests	16
	4. Student Attitude, Study Hours, etc.	24
	5. Student Rating of Teachers	29
	6. Student and Teacher Reactions and Recommendations	33
IV:	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	35
TABLES		41
NOTES		68

A TRIPLE-TRACK PROGRAM IN THE SECOND-YEAR FRENCH COURSES: A PILOT STUDY*

I: INTRODUCTION

Foreign language instruction curriculum is largely determined by its objectives and method of implementation. Nearly all the recently published instructional materials are based on the so-called audio-lingual approach and include as basic components culturally-oriented dialogues, drills for pattern practice, and an inductive presentation of grammar. This approach has won a wide acceptance in many high school and college language programs. It is generally considered "superior" to others such as grammar-translation and direct method of teaching because it aims to develop the four fundamental language skills of listening comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing in a systematic matter.[1] It works quite well in the beginning courses where lessons are presented more slowly than in advanced courses and no unrealistically high degree of linguistic competence is expected as a terminal behavior. At the University of Michigan, a teaching method based on the audio-lingual approach has been used for many years. It is a modification of the strictly audio-lingual instruction in several respects, such as the introduction of reading and writing from the beginning rather than its postponement until students have gained sufficient control over the oral-aural skills, and the explicit rather than inductive grammatical analysis. It seems to have been fairly effective for the majority of first-year students in French.

---

*The research reported herein received financial support from the Center for Research and Learning and the Office of the Dean, College of Literature, Science, and Arts, of the University of Michigan. The writer wishes to acknowledge the valuable assistance given by Professor Milholland for the preliminary analysis of the statistical information, Mr. Peter Kunsman for computer programming, and Mr. Albert Descoteaux for the compilation of the raw data.

In the second-year courses, however, a language program with a single teaching method gives rise to some pedagogical and administrative problems. Usually there is an increased amount of emphasis placed on reading, while an attempt is made to maintain and even improve the previously acquired oral-aural skills. Yet the differences in the achievement of individual students in each of the four language skills become quite pronounced by the end of the first year. Moreover, some students begin to express their predilections for certain language skills. Finally, as many as fifty percent of the students in the second-year courses have had several years of French in high school and are placed directly in them by the Placement Test. These students show deficiencies in different areas, such as grammar, essential vocabulary, spelling, reading, listening, and speaking. Under these conditions, it has been difficult to maintain a uniform teaching method and objectives to the satisfaction of students as well as teachers.

In an effort to find a solution to the problems outlined above, no less than three proposals have been made in the past five years in the Department of Romance Languages. These proposals aimed to introduce curricular flexibility especially in the second-year courses in view of the students' diverse language backgrounds and preferences for certain skills. It was also thought educationally sound to offer a choice of language skills that the student might wish to develop further while fulfilling the college language requirement. The most recent proposal was initiated by a group of interested Teaching Fellows in November, 1968, during the college-wide student and faculty debate on the question of foreign language requirement. It was tentatively accepted by the Department on the condition that a pilot study be conducted in order to assess the feasibility of such a multiple-track language program.

As a result, three types of language classes were offered in the winter semester of 1969. One type was to be engaged in the "normal" language teaching activities of the second-year courses. The other two were to emphasize "oral French" and "reading" respectively while de-emphasizing the other skills. These classes, which will be referred to in this study as "regular", "oral", and "reading" tracks, were instituted simultaneously in the third-semester as well as fourth-semester courses. Although one might expect an increase in the proficiency of the skills being stressed and a decrease in those that were not emphasized, a null hypothesis was adopted for the purpose of comparison. Stated briefly, the assumption was that the relative emphasis or de-emphasis on certain language skills would not result in a statistically significant increase or decrease of proficiency in them because they were presumabiy inseparable language learning activities.

II: DESIGN OF THE PILOT STUDY

1. Instructional Procedures and Materials

The course syllabi for the regular track called for a grammar review and fairly extensive reading. Grammar review consisted of a study of finer points of structures and vocabulary distinctions through explanations, oral-aural drills, and written homework assignments including compositions. Reading work consisted of two to three readers per semester. These readers were studied in class through discussions on the meaning of a story or a passage and students' reactions to it, and questionson lexical and structural items, idiomatic expressions, factual and corroborative information on the text, stylistic points, and so forth. The expected proportion of time to be spent on grammar review and reading was approximately 45 percent and 55 percent respectively in the third semester, and 40 percent and 60 percent in the fourth semester. Classes were to be conducted in French as much as possible.

The experimental tracks were originally designed by several interested Teaching Fellows and were modified in a series of meetings with the supervisor and some of the senior-staff members. The reading track was to de-emphasize grammar review as well as audio-lingual activities. The amount of reading was increased by approximately 30 percent with some emphasis on translation from French to English. Both intensive and extensive reading was to be done, and a direct comprehension of the text was encouraged. Discussions of the reading material were to be carried out in English although the use of French in simple questions and answers was not ruled out. Written assignments consisted of grammar exercises and occasional essays and compositions. In many respects, the reading track resembled the traditional reading-oriented language program as recommended by Coleman in the late 1920's.[2]

The oral track was to de-emphasize both grammar review and reading in order to increase the opportunities for active speaking and listening practice. Remedial pronunciation exercises were to be given in the first few weeks of classes. The reading material was planned to be approximately 35 percent of the amount assigned in the regular track and was to provide topics for conversation and debates. Written assignments consisted of dialogues, skits, and compositions. About one day a week was designated as "open time" for debates, skits, role-play, games, guest lecturers, slides, and so forth. While the third-semester group used an audio-lingually oriented grammar book, the fourth-semester group had none. In the latter, the instructors were to keep a record of typical errors made by students and correct them with appropriate explanations and remedial exercises.

The textbooks used in the three tracks are listed below. The names of the publishers and authors or editors have been omitted. The percentage figures indicate the approximate amount of

the given book to be covered in the course. Grammar texts are preceded by an asterisk. The Roman numerals I and II refer to the third-semester and fourth-semester courses respectively:

A. Regular track

I. *Active Review of French (45%)
Premiers Textes Littéraires (90)
L'Etranger (100)

II. *Active Review of French (40%)
La Robe et le Couteau (85)
La Symphonie Pastorale (100)

Outside Reading: one of the following texts:[3]

L'Exil et le Royaume (75)
Le Matin des Magiciens (60)
Les Mouches (100)
Trois Nouvelles de Georges Simenon (100)
Visites chez les Français (60)

B. Oral Track

I. *Le Francais d'Aujourd'hui (55%)
Meilleures Pages du Figaro (45)
Paris-Match (two issues)

II. Du Tac au Tac (20%)
L'Amérique d'Aujourd'hui vue par les Français (35)
Paris-Match (two issues)

C. Reading Track

I. *French for Review (65%)
Premiers Textes Littéraires (95)
L'Etranger (100)
Panorama de la Vie Moderne (10)

II. *French for Review (50%)
La Robe et le Couteau (85)
Huis Clos (100)
Panorama de la Vie Moderne (18)
Paris-Match (two issues)
French Poetry from Baudelaire to Present (10)

It is difficult to pin down the percentage of class time devoted to the practice of the four basic language skills. But an analysis of the course syllabus for each track indicates to an extent the emphasis placed on some of the skills. The table below shows the approximate percentage of class time devoted to the textbooks. Grammar refers to the time set aside for the grammar book; the review of syntax and morphology and work on vocabulary distinctions were carried out through oral-aural exercises, written homework, and some reading. Reading means the time spent on the readers, with the discussions, questions, and textual analyses mostly in spoken French in the regular and oral tracks, and mostly in English in the reading track. Others refers to the time used for testing in all the tracks and, in the regular and oral tracks, conversations and speeches not necessarily based on any textbook, and in the reading track, supplementary reading activities.

	I	II
A. Regular Track		
grammar	40 (%)	35
reading	45	50
others	15	15
B. Oral Track		
grammar	25	0
reading	40	40
others	35	60
C. Reading Track		
grammar	25	15
reading	60	70
others	15	15

2. Instruments for Measurement

In order to measure the amount of learning that took place in a given period of time in each track, pretesting and post-

testing of the language proficiency of students were necessary. The use of nationally available standardized tests such as the MLA-Cooperative Test was considered but not implemented. Although this may constitute the weakest feature of the pilot study, the decision not to use such a test was unavoidable in view of the mid-year budgetary considerations and the short time in which the pilot study had to be conducted. Instead, a series of locally-produced tests were utilized, two of which were expressly made for the experiment. The following is a description of these tests.

A. Proficiency Test

This was one of the two proficiency tests produced in the preceding year. Its items included all the vocabulary and structural points contained in the Français Fondamental: Premier Degré, a frequency count of spoken French sponsored by the French Ministry of Education.[4] Three typical second-year review grammar texts and several readers were also utilized for the construction of additional grammatical and lexical test items. All items involved a multiple-choice selection of responses and were machine-scorable. The formula for the correction for guessing was Total Rights minus one-third Total Wrongs.

Part One, Grammar (35 minutes) consisted of 80 monolingual (French) and 40 bilingual (English-French translation) items. Part Two, Listening Comprehension (25 minutes) consisted of 14 sound-symbol association items, 20 "pure" auditory comprehension items, and 12 "hybrid" items combining listening and rapid reading of short written answers. All items were given twice in succession. Part Three, Reading and Vocabularly (40 minutes) was comprised of 28 translation items (French to English), 44 monolingual items on synonymous expressions, and 22 reading comprehension items based on two prose passages and one poem. The entire test underwent rigorous item-analysis and two revisions. The estimate of

reliability through Odd-Even Spearman-Brown formula, based on a random sampling of one-hundred students at the end of the fourth semester, yielded coefficients of .86, .74, and .82 for the three parts.

B. Speaking Test (8 minutes)

This test consisted of three sections. In Section One, students read a short dialogue which contained 20 items based on French phonemic contrasts and pronunciation difficulties of American-English speakers. Section Two had 10 oral questions in French, repeated twice in succession, on a single everyday situational topic. Each answer was evaluated in terms of fluency, vocabulary, structure, and pronunciation on multiple-point scales. In Section Three, a drawing of a comic situation was shown and students were asked to describe it in the first or third person singular. Their responses were graded in the same manner as in the preceding section but with the addition of global ratings. After weighting of the three parts, the total possible points were 10, 35, and 15 respectively. Grading was Total Rights only.

This test was administered in the language laboratory and the recorded tapes were checked by a panel of three judges.[5] For each part of the test, the scores issued by the judges were combined and divided by three so as to derive the mean score. The total score of a student on the entire test was the sum of the three mean scores for the three parts. A fairly high degree of unanimity was reached in all the grading sessions, each of which lasted approximately two hours. A random sampling of thirty students on the posttest yielded an estimate of the standard error of measurement of 2.1 insofar as the total scores were concerned.[6]

C. Writing Test (30 minutes)

This test consisted of five parts. Part One had 10 fill-in items (10 points). Part Two contained five questions to be answered in complete sentences using pronouns (10 points). Part Three had seven completion items (7 points). Part Four was a connected passage about an auto accident, with approximately 40 percent of the paragraph in dehydrated sentences (22 points).[7] The last section dealt with a short dialogue between two people, with the second person's part missing. Students were to insert appropriate statements, rejoinders, and questions in view of the context of the conversation (7 points). The test was group-graded by the supervisor and the instructors of the pilot experiment. Grading was Total Rights only.

D. Others

In addition, an extensive survey of the students' language background, attitudes toward the course, reactions to the instructional materials, suggestions for future activities, and so forth was made at the beginning and toward the end of the semester. Moreover, the instructors were requested to keep a log of the various classroom activities and their durations, the nature of lesson preparations, conferences with students outside the class, etc. They also submitted one copy each of all the quizzes, examinations, supplementary teaching materials, and other handouts. At the end of the term, they wrote an evaluation of the track and made recommendations for future planning. Tabulatable portions of all these questionnaires and records are included in the present study.

3. Teacher Selection

After some discussions, it was decided to have two sections each of the three tracks in the third-semester course, and an equal number of sections in the fourth-semester course. An out-

line of the pilot experiment was distributed to all teachers in December. Primary selection of the instructors for the program was on a volunteer basis and the final selection on teaching experience, proficiency in French, and interest expressed in a particular track. Since it was felt that the teaching of a new course would entail a considerable amount of preparation time for the teachers, the volunteers were assigned to one experimental or control section, and one regular section not involved in the experiment. Table I is a summary of the backgrounds of the volunteer teachers. It indicates that they were substantially equal in age and previous teaching experience.

During the semester, conferences were held regularly with the teachers and the supervisor in order to discuss various administrative and pedagogical problems. All the teachers showed a high degree of interest in the progress of the experiment. Records of these meetings were kept and made available to the members of the Department.

4. Student Selection

In the selection of students, no rigid adherence to the principle of random sampling was observed. It was clearly impossible to do so under the circumstances since ... plans were publicized by the student newspaper and inquiries ... students were received even before the end of the fall semester. Furthermore, despite the great possibility of the undesirable "Hawthorne" effect in the subsequent study, we felt that the selection of students on voluntary basis was quite justifiable in view of the future program; if the triple-track system were to become a permanent feature of the second-year French curriculum, the sections designated as "special" tracks would be announced ahead of time in order to draw only those students who are interested. Thus the type of students enrolled in the three experimental tracks would not differ radically from the expected future registration patterns.

The experimental and control sections were established at the hours when there was at least another section not involved in the pilot study, so that the students could transfer in or out of the sections without undue scheduling difficulties. On the first day of classes, the basic nature of the experimental sections was described to all students. In the control sections it was announced that there would be a series of special tests and questionnaires but that otherwise these sections would in no way differ from all the other "regular" classes. By the end of the first week which was set as the deadline, up to 50 percent of the population changed in the sections under study. At the very beginning of the term students were asked to list the four language skills according to the degree of interest they found in them. Table II C is a tabulation of their responses. The students who were interested primarily in the audio-lingual activities consiituted 40.6 percent, 81.1 percent, and 24.2 percent of the enrollment in the regular, oral, and reading tracks of the two courses. Conversely, those who showed more interest in reading held 56.5 percent, 8.9 percent, and 69.7 percent of the three tracks. In other words, the majority of students in the oral track were primarily interested in oral-aural work while most of those in the reading track preferred reading activities. In the control groups there were comparatively more students interested in reading than in the audio-lingual work.

Tables II A and B describe the population samples in the six experimental and control groups. Students in the three tracks constituted 28.2 percent of the total enrollment of 366 in the third-semester course and 27.0 percent of 411 students in the other. The attempt to keep the enrollment even in all the sections was not very successful. The oral track attracted more students than the other two, particularly the coeds. In the two courses combined, coeds held 39.2 percent, 57.0 percent, and 48.5 percent of

the total populations of the three tracks. Although the large enrollment made teaching oral sections much more difficult, we had to assume that the track would not receive a preferential treatment of smaller class size even if it were to become a regular part of the curriculum. Quite possibly the large enrollment had an effect on the performance of the class to some extent. In the oral tracks were also more students who had studied French in high school. In the combination of the two courses, students with high school French constituted 68.2 percent, 84.8 percent, and 74.2 percent of the populations in the three tracks.

The oral track attracted more freshman students than the others. The percentage of Freshmen in the three tracks was 43.5, 70.9, and 51.5 respectively. The reading track had more upperclassmen than the other two. In the two courses combined, the percentage of Juniors and Seniors was found to be 20.2 for the control group, 10.1 for the oral group, and 26.6 for the reading group. It may well be that these upperclass students postponed the fulfillment of their language requirement for one reason or another and thought that they would be more at home in a reading-oriented class because of their interrupted language study. Another point of interest is the high percentage of students who had studied foreign languages other than French, especially in the experimental tracks. Students with exposures to another foreign language constituted 47.8 percent of the control group, 59.6 percent of the oral track, and 69.7 percent of the reading track. Possibly the number of students with experience in other languages might be another variable in the study that should have been investigated. At any rate, as many as 126 students out of 214 (58.9 percent) in the three tracks had studied another foreign language in high school of college.

III: RESULTS OF THE STUDY

1. Pretests

The results of all tests were analyzed through a relatively simple method of correlations and comparison of means by t tests. Table III shows the scores on the pretests administered to students by the end of the first week of classes and the grades in the previous French course. The performance of each group is recorded in terms of the mean (average) score, the standard deviation, and the number of students who took the test.[8] Under t is given the size of t and a reference to the relative importance of the difference between the mean scores of the two groups, with all the statistically significant differences beyond $p<.10$ indicated.[9]

At a first glance, the mean scores on all the pretests may seem to differ considerably between the two groups in comparison, and at least numerically the experimental groups appear superior to the control group. In reality, however, the differences were statistically significant in only two out of twenty cases, meaning that the majority of the differences were probably due to chance elements and that the overall language proficiency as well as the average grades received in the preceding French course were approximately equal among the three tracks. Significant differences were found in the fourth-semester groups. The mean speaking test score of the oral group was higher than that of the control group at $p<.05$. The mean listening score of the reading track was also higher than that of the control group at $p<.02$. The higher mean reading score of the reading group approached significance ($0<.10$). At least in the fourth-semester course, it is possible that the oral track attracted students who were already somewhat more proficient in the speaking skill, and the reading track had students whose reading ability was somewhat above that of the stu-

dents in the control group. Although statistically non-significant, it is also interesting to note that the experimental tracks appear to have attracted students with slightly higher grades in the previous French course. This was particularly the case of the third-semester reading track, where the difference of mean grades between it and the control group was almost significant ($p<.10$). At any rate, a "matched-pair" design was obviously impossible to achieve in our pilot experiment, but the three groups in each course were essentially equal in their general language performance and seemed to justify the study of the average group differences.

Table IV reveals the extent of correlations among the five pretests and the grades in the preceding course.[10] In nearly all the cases, the grades showed significant but varying correlations with the tests, indicating that the grades can be quite a dependable indication of the students' overall performance on tests, particularly reading and writing. Listening comprehension and speaking correlated more highly with each other than with the others, with a possible implication that these two might be testing interdependent activities or perhaps two aspects of one general skill. The grammar test assessed apparently more of the so-called secondary communication skills of reading and writing since it correlated more significantly with them than with listening or speaking. Reading and writing tended to correlate more highly with each other than with the other skills, perhaps because they are closely related learning activities.[11]

2. Main Instructional Activities

Throughout the semester each instructor kept a record of lesson plans and the amount of time spent on various classroom activities. Table V is a summary of the records submitted by the instructors at the end of the term. The number of class periods

is smaller in the oral track because of initial time loss in scheduling classes and the dismissal of class meetings due to illnesses or get-togethers after a commercial French film in town. Time spent on all activities outside the classroom is listed under Other Activities.

In general, time allotted to different classroom work paralleled the original plan of the experimental and control programs. Thus the oral and reading tracks devoted much less time to grammar study than did the control track, especially in the fourth-semester course. Time allocated to reading was greater in the reading track, and less in the oral track, than in the control sections. Under Conversations are included activities such as free and guided conversations and discussions, showing of slides and short movies, playing records, and particularly in the oral track, skits, games, pronunciation lessons, and guest lecturers. Obviously, this type of work occupied a substantial portion of the class time in the oral sections while it took much less class time in the other two groups. Time spent on testing included weekly or biweekly quizzes as well as the mid-term examination and part of the posttests (writing) in all the tracks. Testing consumed less time in the oral track presumably because of lesser amounts of work on grammar and reading and also due to the difficulty of administering oral tests in the classroom. Time devoted to the completion of questionnaires, reading notices, and announcements, and discussion of course objectives is listed under Others. It occupied more class time in the fourth-semester oral group because, according to one instructor, the frequent class discussions on what kind of activities to chart for the "open time" were reported in this column.

In examining the time spent on lesson preparation and grading of quizzes we must take into account the nature of the experimental programs. Since all the teachers in the control groups

had taught their courses at least twice before, they were quite familiar with the instructional materials and thus spent a relatively small amount of time in preparing lessons. On the other hand, the instructors in the experimental sections were engaged in the teaching of virtually new courses because many of the textbooks and classroom activities marked a departure from the regular courses, and they were thus obliged to adapt themselves to different materials, teaching methods, and objectives.

Each teacher was expected to keep one office hour for every course he was assigned to.. Since all those involved in the pilot study had two classes to teach, they kept a minimum of two office hours per week for their students. As far as the control and reading groups were concerned, these hours apparently sufficed for all student consultations and conferences. The oral track teachers were in more frequent contact with their students. Most of them organized parties (on the average of once during the semester), coffee hours, showed movies, went to see commercial films with the students and discussed their impressions afterwards, and gave additional help in pronunciation and conversation practice. Speaking tests and quizzes were given through individual interviews. One instructor in the fourth-semester oral track showed not only considerable enthusiasm for the new program but also spent an extraordinary amount of time with the students, as reflected in the table. As it is known, the enthusiasm of a teachers often motivates his students, and it is an important variable to be considered in the evaluation of differences in student achievement.

3. Posttests

At the end of the semester, five posttests were administered: the writing test in the individual classes, the speaking test in the language laboratory, and the proficiency test in a large

auditorium for the entire group. The last-mentioned test, consisting of grammar, auditory comprehension, and reading was the same one that was used in pretesting. The speaking and writing tests were basically the same as the pretests but with the modification of the order of items and approximately one-third of the vocabulary.

Table VI lists the results of the posttests and the course grades. None of the differences in the mean scores between the groups were found statistically significant but two approached significance at $p<.10$ level. In the third-semester oral track, students registered numerically inferior mean scores on all but the speaking test, as compared to the control group, even though none of the differences were significant. The reading track scored somewhat higher in reading (near-significant at $p<.10$) reflecting perhaps the emphasis placed on this skill. But numerically speaking, nearly all other scores were below those of the control group. The results of the fourth-semester groups paralleled to a great extent those of the third-semester groups. The oral track showed higher scores in listening and speaking but not significantly so. It scored lower on all other tests and, in the case of reading, the difference was near-significant at $p<.10$ level, reflecting probably the de-emphasis of this skill. The reading track showed almost the same mean scores on listening and reading as the control group but the scores on other tests were consistently lower.

The amount of learning that took place in the different tracks may be measured to some extent by comparing the gain scores, that is, the differences between the pretest and posttest scores registered by each student. Table VII shows the mean scores derived by averaging the positive and negative gains of all students in each group. It will be seen that, on the whole, the relative

emphasis and de-emphasis placed on certain language skills did result in some statistically significant differences in the mean gain scores.

In the third-semester course, all tracks registered positive mean gains between the pretests and posttests. The oral track did not improve its scores as much as the control group except on the writing test. In writing, the mean pretest and posttest scores were lower than those of the control group, but the rate of gain was higher. The de-emphasis of reading is reflected in the lower gain score which neared statistical significance ($p<.10$). The slight edge it seemed to have on grammar disappeared by the end of the semester, most probably due to the lack of stress in this area, so that the gain score was quite significantly below that of the control group at $p<.005$. The reading track fared a little better than the oral track in several respects. It showed a numerically superior rate of score gain in both speaking and reading. Its speaking scores were lower than the control group on both pretest and posttest but its gain was higher. In reading, it improved its score to the point that the posttest score was near-significantly higher (at $p<.10$), and the gain score was numerically higher. On the other hand, the slightly, better performance on the listening and grammar pretests was not maintained on the posttests, in which the control goup posted not only higher scores but also greater gain scores, significantly so in grammar ($p<.02$).

The results of the comparison among the fourth-semester tracks show an extension of the trend observed in the third-semester course. The posttest scores of all the tracks were higher than the scores on the pretests, except on the grammar tests of the oral track where the two test scores were almost identical. The oral track maintained its numerical superiority on listening and speaking tests but showed less gain than the control group. Its

higher performance on the reading, grammar, and writing pretests was not repeated on the posttests, with the result that the lower rate of gain in these areas as compared to the control group was statistically significant at $p<.001$, $<.05$, and $<.001$ respectively. The gain scores of the oral track were consistently below those of the control group, implying that the slight initial advantages in certain language skills as shown on the pretents were leveled out by the end of the semester, or, although quite unlikely, that these tests did not measure accurately any part of the kind of learning activities that took place in this track during the semester. As for the reading track, it had numerically higher initial scores on speaking and grammar, but they were replaced by scores lower than those of the control group. Lower gain scores were registered in all the areas and the differences were statistically significant in listening, reading, and grammar at $p<.005$, $<.05$, and $<.01$ respectively. The gain score on the speaking test also neared significance, at $p<.10$ level.

A summary of comparisons among the three tracks is given in Table VIII. In nearly all areas the rate of gain which is reflected as a mean increase of points in the posttests was higher in the control group. Only two scores showed numerically greater but non-significant gains in the experimental groups; namely, the writing test scores of the oral French track and the speaking scores of the reading track in the third semester course. The slightly higher initial mean scores of the experimental groups on at least four out of five pretests were not repeated on the posttests, so that these groups scored below the control group in three out of five posttests.

In order to ascertain whether or not any particular segments of a track benefited more or less from the given program, an analysis of the performance of the upper and lower 30 percent of each

group was made. Tables IX through XII are summaries of the results. In the third-semester oral track, the upper and lower 30 percent showed no statistically significant differences in pretest scores as compared to the equivalent groups in the control sections. On the posttests, both groups showed lower scores in reading, and the score of the upper 30 percent was almost significantly below that of the control group, at $p<.10$ level. Conversely, on the grammar test, the lower 30 percent performed significantly below its counterpart in the control track at $p<.02$, while the lower score of the upper 30 percent was non-significant. Insofar as gain scores were concerned, the upper segment showed a difference approaching significance (<.10) in listening and a definitely significant difference in grammar (<.01). The lower 30 percent registered a smaller rate of gain nearing significance (<.10) only in reading. In the reading track, the lower 30 percent of the students did somewhat better than its peer group in the control sections in listening (<.10), but worse in speaking (<.05), on the pretests. The posttest results erased these differences but created another: the lower score achieved by the upper 30 percent was significant at $p<.02$ level. In the gain scores, the lower 30 percent did numerically better on all but the listening test as compared to the upper 30 percent. The latter scored significantly below in grammar gain ($p<.025$).

In the fourth-semester oral track, both the upper and lower 30 percent of the students showed no statistically significant differences from their counterparts in the control track on any of the pretests. On the posttests, however, both groups of students did not do as well as the control sections in reading, statistically significant at $p<.02$ and near-significant at $p<.10$ respectively. The only other significant difference was shown by the lower 30 percent in grammar (<.02). In the gain scores, both upper and

lower strata of students scored numerically below their counterparts in the control sections on all but the listening test. Their scores were significantly below those of the control sections in reading ($<.001$ and $<.01$ respectively) and in grammar ($<.02$ and $<.01$). The lack of systematic grammar review and extensive reading appears thus to have definitely affected the performance of the oral track in these areas. The lower 30 percent achieved in fact a mean posttest score below its own pretest score in grammar. Some "unlearning" of grammar seems to have taken place in this group during the semester. On the writing test, the statistically significant lower gain for the oral track ($at<.05$) was not a characteristic of either the upper or lower group, although it should be noted that the posttest score of the upper 30 percent was below its pretest score.

In the reading track, both the upper and lower 30 percent of students showed no significantly different pretest scores from those of the control sections except in reading and writing. In reading, the upper 30 percent did a little better ($<.10$) while in writing, the lower 30 percent did worse ($<.10$). On the posttests, both groups scored consistently below their counterparts in the control sections except in two areas: the upper 30 percent did numerically better in listening and speaking, while the lower 30 percent scored below the control group at $p<.10$ level. In the gain scores, the only numerically higher scores (but non-significant) was posted by the lower 30 percent in writing. In all other areas, the performance of both groups was below their equivalents in the control sections and four significant and near-significant low gain scores were found. The upper 30 percent did significantly worse on reading and grammar ($<.02$ and $<.05$ respectively) while the lower 30 percent did somewhat poorly on listening and grammar (both at $<.10$ level).

Of the twenty comparative posttest scores of the experimental groups, the upper 30 percent showed statistically significant low scores on two tests, and near-significant low scores on one test. On the other hand, the lower 30 percent did significantly below its counterpart in the control group on two tests, and near-significantly below on another two tests. These lower scores coincided only in the reading test for the fourth-semester oral track. As for gain scores, the upper 30 percent had a significantly smaller rate of gain in six tests, while the lower 30 percent showed a significantly smaller rate in only two tests, and a near-significant rate in one. In examining these data, one must, of course, consider the fact that it is usually more difficult for the better students to improve their already high test scores. At any rate, the general pattern of performance seems to indicate a tendency for the lower one-third of students in the experimental sections to have a somewhat smaller loss of performance than the upper one-third. An examination of the course grades in Table X tends to support this view. In the third-semester course both the upper and lower groups of the experimental tracks achieved lower mean course grades than the regular track. Numerically at least it was more noticeable in the upper group, and the difference between the reading and regular tracks was statistically significant at $p<.02$. In the fourth-semester course, although non-significant, the upper groups had lower gain scores whereas the lower groups had higher gain scores.

Table XIII shows the intercorrelations of the posttests. On the whole they are quite similar to those of the pretests. The course grade was found to correlate very significantly with the posttest scores in twenty-six out of thirty cases involving the six experimental and control groups. Grammar tests correlated also significantly this time not only with the reading and writing, but also with listening and speaking. As in the pretest, it showed highest

correlation with the writing test and the least with speaking. Its correlation with the secondary communication skills were generally higher than with the primary communication skills. This test and writing correlated with the course grades better than the others did. The grammar test might be a better index of a student's general proficiency than the other tests when they are given separately. The writing test showed fairly high degrees of correlation with the others, notably reading and grammar. In general, as in the case of the pretests, listening and speaking correlated more highly with each other than with the other tests. Although one might expect the oral-aural tests in the oral track and the reading-writing tests in the reading reading track to show higher correlation coefficients with the course grades, no such trends were detected except in the fourth-semester reading group.

Table XIV reveals the intercorrelations of the pretests and posttests. As to be expected, the correlation of the pretest and posttest on the same skill tended to be much higher than the correlations of different skills on the two tests, indicating the relative purity of all the tests. It is also interesting to observe that the pretests in grammar and writing, probably tapping the same kind of skill, correlated significantly in the majority of cases with any of the posttests, while there seemed to be no reverse tendency--that is, no high correlations between the grammar and writing posttests and any of the pretests of different skills. It should be noted that the intercorrelations between the speaking pretest and listening posttest as well as the intercorrelations between the listening pretest and speaking posttest were significant in ten out of twelve cases. One implication of this finding is that both listening and speaking tests tap the same kind of language skills and that either one of the two given at the beginning of the course could serve as a useful predictor of the general performance of students in the audio-lingual areas.

4. Student Attitudes, Study Time, etc.

During the semester students were asked to complete two questionnaires concerning their language background, attitude toward the course, evaluation of their study habits, rating of their teachers, and so forth. We wished to measure the degrees of motivation exhibited by students as evaluated by the students themselves as well as by their instructors. Lack of time prevented us from developing a sufficiently sensitive multiple-choice type of measurement. However, the questionnaire given at the beginning of the semester contained an item which asked the students to list why they were studying French rather than another foreign language. Their responses were analyzed and classified into five somewhat arbitrary categories based on the amount of passive or positive orientation toward the study of French. Increasing number of points were assigned to more positive replies. Typical answers and their categorization are shown below:

scale	category	type of comments
1	A	Because of language requirement French is supposed to be easy
2	B	Comments like A plus: I started French in high school Friends or family recommended French
3	C	Comments like A, B plus: I like French language and French people French may be useful for my future I am much more interested in French
4	D	Comments like A, B, C plus: I will use it in my future profession I want to use it in my travel I greatly admire French culture
5	E	Comments like A-D plus: I plan to (want to) major in French I plan to (want to) minor in French

One of the items in the end-of-term questionnaire asked the students to state briefly their reactions to the course, i.e. the instructional methods, goals, and materials. Their replies were filed into five categories ranging from negative to positive attitudes shown by the degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the program as expressed in the comments:

scale	description
1	Strongly dissatisfied
2	Generally dissatisfied (dissatisfaction overweighs satisfaction)
3	No opinion, O.K., etc.
4	Generally satisfied (satisfaction is greater than dissatisfaction)
5	Very satisfied

Students were also asked to estimate the approximate number of hours they spent every week on lesson preparation and review. The teachers also supplied information concerning the course grades as well as general attendance of each student. The number of absences could not be determined precisely because several instructors did not keep an attendance record regularly. As a result, both precise and estimated number of absences had to be combined as grouped data and a special scale was adopted, as shown below:

scale	number of absences
1	10 or more
2	6-9 times
3	3-5 times
4	0-2 times

Table XV indicates the results of tabulation for the five items described above. As far as "motivation" or "orientation" was concerned, the experimental groups in both courses showed a slightly higher degree of interest in the study of French language,

but none of the differences reached any statistically significant level. This finding is rather surprising in view of the general impression of higher motivation among the experimental tracks felt by many instructors. As suggested in the description of the item, it is quite possible that our categories were not refined enough to be sensitive to motivationally different orientations of students.[12] The results of the attitudes toward the course were also inconclusive. In the third-semester course, students in the control track showed somewhat more satisfaction with the curriculum than did those in the experimental groups. On the other hand, in the fourth-semester course, students in the experimental tracks and notably those in the oral sections showed more satisfaction with their respective curriculum. The difference in attitude toward the course between the control group and the oral group was statistically very significant at $p<.001$ level.

The number of absences was lower in the experimental tracks in both courses. Attendance was significantly better in the third-semester experimental groups at $p<.001$ for the oral sections and $<.005$ for the reading sections. In the fourth-semester course, the attendance was near-significantly better in the reading track, at $<.10$ level.

As for the number of study hours, the third-semester groups showed no statistically significant variations although, numerically speaking, those students in the experimental track seemed to have put in more time for review and preparation. In the fourth-semester course, students in the oral track spent significantly less time on homework (at $p<.005$), with a difference of almost two hours per week from the other tracks. It may very well be that the considerably decreased amount of work on reading and grammar study and the elusive and intangible nature of what constitutes the study of oral French at home accounted for this phenomenon. In fact, at one of the meetings held toward the mid-

semester, three out of four oral-track instructors stated that they felt some of their students were not studying oral French, or practicing conversation, at home. Although the instructors attempted to provide additional contact hours by organizing French-speaking parties, coffee hours, and other informal get-togethers, not everybody took advantage of these opportunities. One instructor in the third-semester course reported that the original enthusiasm or festive mood dropped a little after the first quiz but that students began to take the course seriously. At any rate, had all students in the three tracks studied approximately a similar number of hours, there might have been some appreciable differences in the posttest performance. It is interesting to note that the usual expectation that the average student spend about two hours in preparation and review for every class hour was not too far off. In four out of six groups, the mean length of study at home came out to be between seven and eight hours per week, and the courses met four times weekly.

As for the course grades, the control group in the third-semester course received somewhat higher grades than the experimental groups, even though the differences were statistically non-significant. This is a reversal of the data concerning the grades received in the previous course: students in the experimental tracks had slightly higher mean grades in the previous French course, and in the case of the reading track the difference approached significance at $p<.10$. In the fourth-semester course, the students in the experimental groups had numerically higher average grades in the previous course and also received higher mean grades in the course at the end of the term. The differences between the mean grades of the control group and those of the others were found to be almost significant, at $p<.10$ level.

Table XVI presents the intercorrelations of the five items given in the preceding table with the addition of the previous course

grades. In both courses, statistically significant correlations existed between the course grades and "motivation" as well as between course grades and the previous course grades. It should be recalled that Table XIII revealed significant correlations in many cases between the previous course grades and the results of the posttests. It makes us wonder if the performance of a student in the preceding course is not already a useful predictor of his work in a following course. It would be interesting to conduct an extended study of student performance over several semesters to see if, indeed, the relative success or failure of students in later courses is already indicated at the end of the first or second semester. If such were the case, a further investigation of factors like the study habits, motivation, and language aptitude, along with an earlier grade in the language should yield good prognostic data. At any rate, it is to be noted that there was a very low correlation between study time and course grades. In two out of six cases there were negative correlations. It would be of interest to study the correlations between the number of study hours and each of the grades, to see if better students spend less time on preparation and homework than the average or poor students. Both study hours and attendance failed to show any significant correlations with any of the other items. Attitude correlated significantly with motivation in the regular and oral tracks only.

Table XVII shows the intercorrelations of motivation and other factors with the posttest and gain scores. As it can be seen immediately, motivation correlated significantly in many cases with the posttest scores. in the third-semester course it seemed to correlate better with the listening and speaking scores, while in the fourth-semester course its correlationswith the reading, writing, and grammar scores were higher. Motivation showed signif-

icant correlations with the gain scores in four out of five cases in the fourth-semester control group, but not in the experimental groups except on one test (grammar). A similar pattern existed in the third-semester course also, in that the control group showed higher correlations between the gain scores and motivation than the other groups, though all except one were statistically non-significant.

The attitude factor correlated quite significantly with the posttest scores in the third-semester control group but not in the experimental groups. The same trend could be observed in the fourth-semester course even though none of the correlations were found to be significant. The highest correlation coefficients were found between the grammar posttest and gain scores and the motivation-attitude factors of the control groups. In the other groups where grammar study was de-emphasized, none of the correlations reached a significant level except as noted under motivation.

On the whole, attendance did not correlate significantly with the posttest scores. Gain scores and attendance showed significant correlations only in a few instances; namely, on the reading test of the third-semester control group, and the listening and speaking test of the fourth-semester oral group. There was a significant negative correlation between the speaking gain score and attendance in the third-semester reading group. It should also be noted that the correlations were also negative although negligeably so in the other groups. The amount of time spent on study did not seem to have any definite relation to the posttest or gain scores.

5. Student Rating of Teachers

At the end of the term students were asked to "rate" various aspects of their teachers' instructional methods and their atti-

tudes toward the curriculum on a four-point scale. Ten of the items were used in Tables XVIII through XX. The numbers refer to the following questions:

1. General teaching methods and techniques
2. Understanding of the specific course objectives
3. Interaction between the teacher and students
4. Interaction among students
5. Promptness in returning homework and exams
6. Clarity of explanations
7. Daily lesson preparation
8. General availability outside the class for conferences and consultations
9. Enthusiasm and vitality in teaching
10. Attempts to get to know students

In examining the data, we must consider the fact that these figures represent ratings by students rather than by faculty members. Although the evaluations by students and faculty--especially by the supervisor--are not mutually exclusive or contradictory, there are some differences in the criteria used for measurement. For example, the supervisor stresses the so-called observable behavioral functions, that is, the demonstrable categories of good instructional techniques as a basis for comparison of teaching effectiveness.[13] Included among such categories are aspects like the command of French, organization of class meetings, classroom interaction, manner of lesson presentation, clarity of explanations, efficient use of exercises, questioning techniques, and so on. Students are able to pass a judgment on these topics only to a limited degree. On the other hand, the supervisor is less likely to know items such as the instructor's promptness in returning written work and tests (for better learning and review), his general accessibility to all students outside the class, and his attempts to get to know students. Thus the ten

items and the ratings measure a teacher's effectiveness to some extent but they also reflect his "popularity" among the students.

The method of comparison used in Table XVIII is different from the one utilized to study the average group differences on various tests and other measurements. In this table, one track is compared with the combination of the two other tracks, in the hope that the differences shown by one track would be isolated more clearly. In comparison with the control groups, we note immediately the high ratings received by the teachers of the oral track and the low ratings of those in the reading track. In the third-semester course, the instructors of the oral track were rated higher on all ten items, seven of which were statistically significant. Conversely, those in the reading track were rated lower on nine out of ten items, five of which were significant. There were, of course, different ratings for each teacher and the the table lists only the mean rating of the two teachers in each track. Table XIX indicates the differences between the two teachers which were found to be statistically significant. In each track, there was at least one item on which one teacher was rated far above the other, in fact numerically higher than the mean ratings of the teachers in the other tracks.

In the fourth-semester groups, again the teachers in the oral track were rated consistently higher on all the items, and seven out of ten items showed significant differences from the ratings received by the teachers in the other tracks. The instructors in the reading track were rated lower than the others in nine out of ten items, six of which were statisticllly significant. On two items, however, the significantly lower rating was directed toward one of the two teachers. In four items, the two teachers were rated numerically higher than the control section teachers. But in the latter, statistically significant differences were

found on several items: in three out of five items, Teacher A was rated considerably higher than Teacher B, whereas in two other items the situation was reversed. Undoubtedly these discrepancies affected the general comparison of student reactions to teachers from one track to another.

It is interesting to note the ratings on the question concerning classroom interaction between teacher and students and among students, the teacher's general accessibility to students outside the class, his "vitality and enthusiasm" in teaching, and his attempts to get to know the students. It is particularly in these areas that the oral-track teachers were rated higher than the others and they probably reflect not only a higher "morale" but also the enthusiasm for the kind of activities engaged by the oral-track classes in their "open time" and get-togethers sponsored by the teachers outside the classroom, which we discussed in connection with Table V.

The results of intercorrelation study on the ten items are reported in Table XX. Generally speaking, item 1 (teaching methods and techniques) correlated highly with items 2 (understanding of the specific course objectives), 3 (teacher-student interaction), 6 (clarity of explanations), and 9 (enthusiasm and vitality), indicating the close relationship of these aspects. They probably tap the area of general teaching methods and procedures as seen by students. Item 3 correlated well with item 4 (interaction among students), 9, and 10 (attempts to get to know students), all of which seem to do with the teacher's personality and popularity. On the other hand, items 5 (promptness in returning homework and tests) and 9 (general availability outside class) showed much lower correlations with any of the items on the matrix, probably because they were tapping the aspects of the teachers quite different from or unrelated to the others.

6. Student and Teacher Reactions and Recommendations

Student reactions to the language programs were sought in a questionnaire toward the end of the semester. They were divided into the aspects students liked most and least, and are summarized in Table XXI. The comments on textbooks were inconclusive because in most instances the number of favorable comments were counterbalanced by unfavorable ones. In the experimental tracks an overwhelming majority of students liked the use of the magazine Paris-Match.[14] In the control and oral tracks many students enjoyed the use of spoken French, guided or unguided conversations, and speeches in class. There were more students who reacted favorably rather than unfavorably to the assignment of essays and compositions.

In the oral track where many new activities were introduced, students enjoyed the records, singing, slides, movies, games, skits, guest lecturers, and "outside activities" such as get-togethers after a movie and parties. Students in the third-semester oral track and the fourth-semester control and reading groups liked the reading materials in general. In the control and reading tracks, several expressed their enjoyment of the literary discussions in class, presumably based on their reading materials and carried out mostly in French in the control group and in English in the other. Unfavorable reactions to these discussions exceeded the favorable ones only in the fourth-semester reading course. Among the control group, only one out of five students objected to the type of quizzes given, whereas in the others combined, as many as eighteen out of twenty-five voiced the same opinion. Among the items disliked by many in the three tracks were the study of grammar, course-wide examinations, and homework assignments.

The teachers and students were also asked to make recommendations for the future planning of the respective curriculum. The results of the tabulation are given in Table XXII. The item receiving most comments was the change of textbooks. In some items the suggestions were divided between more of one thing or less of the same, cancelling out, as it were, the suggestions, as observed in the amount of reading and written compositions and essays. The number of recommendations for more oral-aural work outweighed the number of comments for less work. It is interesting to note, especially in connection with the finding on the study time, that some students in the fourth-semester oral track seemed to want more work in the course, including laboratory practice. In this track, as many as ten students wished to have a smaller class size, a quite understandable request in view of the large number of students in the two oral sections.

the instructors of all the tracks were asked to list their recommendations for a pre-semester workshop. The following is a summary of their suggestions:

A. Regular Track

1. More frequent meetings of teachers and students
2. Discussion of testing techniques in general

B. Oral Track

1. Reduction of "unstructured" time
2. Specific activities for open time
3. Classroom interaction techniques
4. Testing of oral and writing proficiency

C. Reading Track

1. Techniques of sight reading
2. Determination of the amount of oral French to be used in class
3. Detailed syllabus
4. More clearly defined goals

The comments by teachers made it abundantly clear that the experimental tracks lacked very specific teaching goals as well as a method of evaluating the effectiveness of the new techniques andthe soundness of the course objectives. Many of the different pedagogical and administrative problems were discussed and resolved during the regular meetings of the instructors, but these conferences also indicated the difficulty of planning a language curriculum, especially in as short a time as the instructors had for the pilot study.

IV: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

As originally planned, the experimental tracks succeeded in attracting students whose interest lay in the skills that were to be stressed in teaching. Thus the oral track drew in students primarily interested in speaking and hearing French and also whose proficiency in speaking was somewhat higher than that of students in the control group. In the reading track were students who were not only interested in reading but also whose mean reading score was a little higher than that of the others. On the whole, these tracks proved to be attractive to somewhat better students in that their mean grades in the previous French courses were higher and comparatively more students had high school French and showed slightly better performance on some pretests. The oral track tended to have more freshman students and more coeds than the others, while the reading track had a higher number of upperclassmen. Students generally did not exhibit significant differences in their motivation toward the study of French although it was slightly higher among the experimental-track students. In all the tracks the students' general performance on the posttest was closely related to--or reflected in--their motivational orientation toward the study of French. As far as

attitudes toward the specific programs were concerned, students in the third-semester experimental tracks were somewhat less satisfied than those in the control group. An opposite situation existed in the fourth-semester course, and the oral track showed a significantly higher degree of satisfaction than the other two. Generally speaking, the attitude toward the specific course program and the posttest performance were not significantly correlated except in the control groups. Students in the third-semester experimental sections received a slightly lower mean course grade at the end of the semester, while the tendency was reversed in the fourth-semester course and the differences in the mean course grades approached statistical significance.

The time spent on various instructional activities paralleled closely the original plans for the three tracks. As compared to the control group, the oral track devoted much less time to grammar review and reading and more time on audio-lingual work. The reading track spent less time on grammar review and oral-aural practice but read substantially more during the semester. The oral-track teachers were more active than the others in the so-called "outside activities" and were rated much more favorably by their students. The teachers in the reading track were rated below those in the control groups in several areas.

The results of the pretests and posttests did not prove that the null-hypothesis adopted for the study was completely justified. On the posttests, there were indications that the relative emphasis and de-emphasis of certain language skills did have some bearing on the test performance. In the third-semester course, the oral track showed no statistically significant differences in achievement from that of the control group, whereas the reading sections did show a higher reading score on the posttest approaching statistical significance. As for the gain scores, the oral

track showed near-significant lower gains in reading, probably as a result of the de-emphasis of this skill in the program. Both experimental tracks posted statistically significant low gain scores on the grammar test, again as a result of the decreased amount of work in this area.

In the fourth-semester course, the oral track scored below the control group in reading and grammar, the differences being near-significant. The posttest scores of the reading track showed no statistically significant differences from those of the control sections. In gain scores, however, both experimental tracks registered significantly lower scores in three out of five areas. The oral track showed markedly lower gain scores in reading, writing, and grammar, and the reading track in listening, reading, and grammar, with a near-significant difference in speaking. In the case of the reading track, an emphasis on reading actually resulted in a gain score significantly below that of the control group.

An analysis of the performance by the upper and lower 30 percent of each group showed that the lower 30 percent of students in the experimental tracks posted significantly low gain scores in fewer cases than the upper 30 percent. This is probably due to the fact that the improvement of performance is easier to detect with the lower groups than with the upper groups, whose scores are already quite high. In general, as far as the course grades were concerned, the lower 30 percent of the experimental groups did only slightly poorly in comparison with its peer group in the third-semester control sections, and actually a little better in the fourth-semester course. Perhaps the lower groups benefited more from the experimental tracks than the upper 30 percnet.

What is puzzling is that in some cases the stress put on certain language skills resulted in superior performance but not

consistently so, whereas the de-emphasis of other skills almost invariably brought about a decreased performance. If our null-hypothesis was untenable, we would have at least hoped that the relative emphasis or de-emphasis resulted always in a corresponding demonstrable increase or decrease in these skills. Apparently the "Hawthorne" effect was felt not so much in student performance or motivation as in their attitude toward the course and the teachers. In the regular and reading tracks, there were no positively new activities, whereas in the oral track, especially in the fourth semester, new techniques were constantly introduced, the teachers were well liked, and students felt that they were consulted in the planning of part of the program.

In the oral track both teachers and students seemed to show a high degree of enthusiasm toward the program, and there were many efforts to make the course "interesting". Students had somewhat higher grades in the previous French courses, and they enjoyed the type of activities in their classes much more than the others enjoyed theirs. Yet they did not perform significantly better than the students in the control group on any of the , tests and in the fourth-semester group, showed significantly lower gain scores in three out of five areas. We may conjecture that the program was not sufficiently systematic or organized to bring about a notable increase in the oral-aural skills, and that the students in the oral track did not practice conversation as much as the others studied reading or grammar, except during the "outside activities" led by the teachers. As has been stated, the study of oral French is less tangible than the assignments in reading or writing and most likely, students found few opportunities for speaking practice outside the classroom.

For the future planning of the oral track, the findings of the pilot study must be applied. Although the study of grammar per se is not very important, a systematic review of essential

vocabulary distinctions and structural items with a modicum of oral-aural exercises seems necessary. One teacher in the fourth-semester course recommended, in fact, the use of a brief reference grammar book in the future. In conversation practice, instead of selecting topics suggested at random by students and teachers, there could be a set of basic situational topics, of which the students are expected to learn all the important expressions in order to converse with reasonable facility. Once these basic topics are mastered, additional themes could be chosen by the teacher and his students from other sources, expecially the reading material.[15] All the teachers agreed in one of the meetings that for their students, the "open time" was the most fun part of their classroom activities. The "open time" programs are surely very interesting and perhaps motivating to a point. But pedagogically meaningful activities should be investigated and catalogued, so that each has educational as well as psychological objectives. Needless to say, a method of measuring the effectiveness of "open time" should be devised so that it is not conducted merely for enjoyment.

In view of the test results and the observations of the teachers, there is a need to give definite and well thought out homework assignments. The instructional materials should include a set of tapes so that the students can have additional practice for the improvement of their pronunciation, aural comprehension, and fluency.

The reading track is much more difficult to teach. Unless the textbooks are chosen with care and the daily classroom tasks are varied as much as possible, the work can become easily monotonous to students. This is probably what happened at times in the reading sections despite the teachers' effort to introduce different, if not new, activities in the classroom. The attempt

to teach "hypothesizing" on meaning, that is, contextual guessing on the meaning of unknown lexical and idiomatic items, was not carried out consistently because of the lack of suitable texts and of the time to develop our own. The amount of translation work from French to English or the use of spoken French in class was never resolved fully during the semester due to conflicting opinions and reactions of some teachers and students. It is possible that the increase in reading material was a little excessive, particularly in the fourth-semester course. Some instructors detected laxity in preparation on the part of some students particularly when more than the usual amount of reading was assigned. The future planning calls for a systematic study of grammar especially useful for reading and writing and a more careful choice of textbooks in terms of contents and difficulty level.

The results of the pilot experiment were generally encouraging in that at least the posttest performance indicated no significant differences among the three tracks. The experimental courses were well received by most students enrolled in them, and as discussed in the introduction of the present study, the establishment of a multiple-track French program creates the needed curricular flexibility in the second-year courses. In the future, a more extended study lasting two or more semesters should be undertaken in order to investigate the questions raised by the pilot experiment. With further modifications in the instructional objectives, methods, and materials, and a constant evaluation of their pedagogical effectiveness, the "special" tracks may show better performance in the gain scores in which they were found below the regular track.

TABLE I: TEACHER BACKGROUND

Group*	Age	Yrs. of experience**	Highest degree held	Specialization
IC	26	3	M.A.	Romance Ling.
	36	3***	M.A.	French Lit.
IExA	29	3	M.A.	French Lit.
	30	2	M.A.	French Lit.
IExB	24	2	M.A.	Romance Ling.
	28	3	M.A.	French Lit.
IIC	27	3	M.A.	French Lit.
	26	4	M.A.	French Lit.
IIExA	26	2	M.A.	French Lit.
	25	2	M.A.	French Lit.
IIExB	26	4	M.A.	Compar. Lit.
	27	4	M.A.	French Lit.

*In this as well as in the subsequent tables, the following group designations are used:

IC : third-semester control group
IExA: third-semester oral-track group
IExB: third-semester reading-track group

IIC : fourth-semester control group
IIExA: fourth-semester oral-track group
IIExB: fourth-semester reading-track group

**Refers to the number of years of teaching in the Department of Romance Languages.

***This instructor had additional years of college-level teaching experience from elsewhere.

TABLE II: STUDENT BACKGROUND

A: GENERAL INFORMATION

Group	IC	IExA	IExB	IIC	IIExA	IIExB
Sample Size*	33	38	32	36	41	34
Sex: male	22	16	21	20	18	13
female	11	22	11	16	23	21
Class: Freshman	23	32	24	7	24	10
Sophomore	7	3	3	18	12	13
Junior	2	1	5	7	2	4
Senior	1	2	0	4	3	7
School: LSA	31	32	32	35	39	33
Others	2	6	0	1	2	1
Nature of Enrollment:						
To fulfill requirem't	31	37	29	33	39	30
Others	2	1	3	3	2	4

*At the mid-semester point.

B: PREVIOUS LANGUAGE EXPERIENCE

Group	IC	IExA	IExB	IIC	IIExA	IIExB
FRENCH						
2HS*	0	0	1	0	1	0
3	1	0	1	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	1	0
1+II**	1	2	0	0	0	0
2+I,II	2	0	0	0	0	0
2+II	19	20	22	0	0	0
3+II	6	13	4	0	0	0
4+II	0	2	1	0	0	0
1+II,III	0	0	0	2	2	2
2+II,III	0	0	0	3	5	1
3+II,III	0	0	0	1	3	0
4+II,III	0	0	0	1	3	0
2+III	0	0	0	2	2	3
3+III	0	0	0	1	7	5
4+III	0	0	0	8	8	9
(had HS French)	(29)	(37)	(29)	(18)	(30)	(20)
(had no HS French)	(4)	(1)	(3)	(18)	(11)	(14)
I,II	2	1	2	0	0	0
I,II,III	2***	0	1***	18	11	14
LATIN: 1-2****	6	16	5	11	10	12
3+	1	1	3	6	2	4
GERMAN: 1-2	1	1	1	1	5	3
3+	0	0	1	0	1	3
SPANISH: 1-2	0	2	2	1	4	2
3+	1	0	1	1	2	2
OTHERS: 1-2	1	1	0	1	1	2
3+	1	0	3	1	1	2
(had a F.L.)*****	(11)	(21)	(16)	(22)	(26)	(30)
(had 2 or more F.L.)	(0)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(4)	(5)

*Arabic numerals refer to the number of years of high school study.

**Roman numerals refer to the number of semesters of college study

***Transfer students and repeaters

****In order to simplify the table, college study is included in the figures for other foreign languages. One semester of college was equated with one year of high school. There were 8 students with college study of another foreign language

*****Excludes French.

C: DEGREE OF INTEREST SHOWN IN THE FOUR LANGUAGE SKILLS

Order of Preference	IC	IExA	IExB	IIC	IIExA	IIExB
LSRW•	4	8	1	5	7	3
LRSW	0	2	3	1	2	2
LSWR	0	2	0	0	1	1
LRWS	1	0	0	1	0	0
SLRW	6	12	1	6	14	1
SRLW	0	5	1	0	5	2
SLWR	1	2	0	0	4	0
SWRL	1	1	0	1	3	1
SWLR	0	3	0	0	1	1
SRWL	2	0	1	1	0	0
RWLS	3	2	7	2	0	5
RSLW	1	1	3	8	2	3
RWSL	1	0	6	2	0	4
RLSW	5	0	2	4	1	4
RLWS	2	0	2	4	0	4
RSWL	3	0	4	0	1	2
WRLS	3	0	0	1	0	0
No Opinion	0	0	1	0	0	1
Summary••						
LS/SL first	14	31	7	14	33	9
R first	18	3	24	21	4	22
Others	1	4	1	1	4	3

•These letters refer to Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing respectively

••Grouped in terms of preferences for the audio-lingual skills or for reading skills.

TABLE III: PRETEST SCORES AND PREVIOUS GRADE

A: THIRD-SEMESTER COURSE

	IC			IExA				IExB			
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	t	Mean	S.D.	N	t
Listening	13.97	6.11	31	14.71	5.59	35	0.52	14.85	4.60	27	0.62
Speaking	36.91	7.39	31	38.75	8.11	36	0.96	33.91	7.28	28	-1.57
Reading	10.57	6.31	30	13.32	11.71	34	1.18	11.76	7.97	25	0.61
Writing	19.10	5.49	31	18.17	7.20	36	-0.59	20.64	7.32	28	0.92
Grammar	18.03	8.71	30	20.69	12.25	35	1.02	21.22	10.39	27	1.26
Prev.Grade*	2.55	0.85	31	2.78	0.76	36	1.17	2.93	0.77	28	1.80[a]

B: FOURTH-SEMESTER COURSE

	IIC			IIExA				IIExB			
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	t	Mean	S.D.	N	t
Listening	17.81	5.59	31	19.95	5.41	38	1.61	21.81	6.28	31	2.65[c]
Speaking	37.43	9.41	31	41.88	7.68	40	2.20[b]	40.68	8.24	31	1.45
Reading	18.57	7.32	30	21.60	9.29	40	1.48	22.67	9.99	30	1.81[a]
Writing	23.74	6.71	31	25.93	9.02	40	1.17	22.90	9.34	30	-0.40
Grammar	26.29	10.24	31	28.13	12.42	40	0.67	30.10	15.90	31	1.12
Prev.Grade	2.32	0.91	31	2.55	0.88	40	1.07	2.68	0.95	31	1.51

*Grades A through E were converted to numerical scores of 4-0.

[a] $<.10$ [b] $<.05$ [c] $<.02$

TABLE IV: INTERCORRELATIONS OF PRETEST SCORES AND GRADES**

A: THIRD-SEMESTER COURSE

	Speaking	Reading	Writing	Grammar	Prev.Grade
Listening	0.65*	0.58*	0.61*	0.47*	0.40
	0.64*	0.27	0.59*	0.53*	0.62*
	0.54*	0.38	0.34	0.25	0.30
	0.63*	0.36*	0.51*	0.42*	0.46*
Speaking		0.37	0.32	0.27	0.50*
		0.20	0.42*	0.19	0.36
		0.40	0.66*	0.42	0.52*
		0.28*	0.41*	0.25	0.40*
Reading			0.69*	0.60*	0.52*
			0.10	0.38	0.15
			0.47*	0.50*	0.64*
			0.29*	0.44*	0.35*
Writing				0.64*	0.66*
				0.60*	0.69*
				0.70*	0.60*
				0.63*	0.64*
Grammar					0.59*
					0.76*
					0.52*
					0.64*

B: FOURTH-SEMESTER COURSE

Listening	0.35	0.13	0.27	0.41	0.35
	0.71*	0.63*	0.52*	0.52*	0.58*
	0.74*	0.68*	0.62*	0.69*	0.67*
	0.66*	0.58*	0.46*	0.57*	0.34*
Speaking		0.27	0.30	0.30	0.21
		0.60*	0.50*	0.37	0.43*
		0.59*	0.59*	0.60*	0.63*
		0.51*	0.46*	0.43*	0.43*
Reading			0.42	0.38	0.47*
			0.64*	0.61*	0.67*
			0.76*	0.87*	0.84*
			0.63*	0.68*	0.68*
Writing				0.53*	0.64*
				0.73*	0.77*
				0.75*	0.78*
				0.67*	0.71*
Grammar					0.66*
					0.63*
					0.73*
					0.67*

*< .01

** Within each block, correlation coefficients are given for the control, oral, and reading groups. The underlined figure represents the coefficient for the combined groups

TABLE V: DISTRIBUTION OF TIME
FOR MAIN ACTIVITIES

Group	No. of Classes	CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES* Grammar Review	Reading	Conversations	Testing	Others	OUTSIDE THE CLASS** Preparation, Grading	Outside Activities
IC	55.5	21.5 (38.1%)	22.9 (41.6%)	3.1 (5.9%)	7.1 (12.8%)	0.9 (1.6%)	32.4	0
IExA	50	14.0 (28.0%)	14.0 (28.0%)	15.7 (31.4%)	5.1 (10.2%)	1.2 (2.4%)	72.6	7.6
IExB	54.5	10.3 (18.9%)	32.8 (60.1%)	1.7 (3.1%)	8.2 (15.0%)	1.5 (2.9%)	33.9	0
IIC	53	16.9 (31.9%)	22.6 (42.6%)	4.7 (8.9%)	6.4 (12.1%)	2.4 (4.5%)	34.2	0
IIExA	50	2.6 (5.2%)	13.9 (27.8%)	23.5 (47.0%)	3.8 (7.6%)	6.2 (12.4%)	56.1	18.1
IIExB	54	6.0 (11.1%)	34.3 (63.6%)	4.0 (7.4%)	7.3 (13.3%)	2.5 (4.6%)	50.8	0

*In terms of class periods (1=50 minutes)

**In terms of actual hours (1=60 minutes)

TABLE VI: POSTTEST SCORES

A: THIRD-SEMESTER COURSE

	IC			IExA				IExB			
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	t	Mean	S.D.	N	t
Listening	18.50	5.67	30	18.25	5.36	36	-0.18	17.00	4.63	27	-1.09
Speaking	40.54	5.71	31	41.74	6.29	36	0.81	38.21	7.09	28	-1.39
Reading	17.65	6.41	31	15.34	7.01	35	-1.39	20.57	7.06	28	1.67*
Writing	22.72	6.38	29	22.33	7.21	36	-0.23	22.78	6.90	27	0.03
Grammar	26.43	11.79	30	21.47	11.94	35	-1.51	24.21	10.34	28	-0.76

B: FOURTH-SEMESTER COURSE

	IIC			IIExA				IIExB			
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	t	Mean	S.D.	N	t
Listening	22.27	5.63	30	23.20	5.03	40	0.73	22.39	6.88	31	0.07
Speaking	42.02	6.56	31	43.87	7.23	40	1.11	41.90	8.53	31	-0.07
Reading	27.10	10.01	31	23.39	9.04	38	-1.61*	27.90	10.79	31	0.31
Writing	26.32	7.22	31	26.15	8.56	40	-0.09	24.09	8.13	31	-1.14
Grammar	33.97	13.12	31	28.08	15.56	40	-1.69*	31.93	18.30	29	-0.49

* <.10

TABLE VII: GAIN SCORES

A: THIRD-SEMESTER COURSE

	IC			IExA				IExB			
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	t	Mean	S.D.	N	t
Listening	4.23	3.16	31	3.85	3.14	34	-0.48	2.48	4.69	27	-1.64
Speaking	3.62	5.64	31	2.71	6.45	36	-0.61	4.18	5.23	27	0.39
Reading	6.96	5.18	28	4.74	5.07	35	-1.71[a]	9.26	6.35	27	1.47
Writing	2.71	3.90	30	4.37	4.53	35	1.53	2.36	4.54	27	-0.32
Grammar	7.79	6.66	29	2.92	6.04	36	-3.09[d]	3.96	5.27	27	-2.40[c]

B: FOURTH-SEMESTER COURSE

	IC			IIExA				IIExB			
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	t	Mean	S.D.	N	t
Listening	4.23	4.92	30	3.67	4.48	39	-0.50	0.58	4.57	31	-3.01[d]
Speaking	4.31	8.16	31	1.73	4.70	39	-1.56	0.86	5.83	31	-1.91[a]
Reading	9.16	7.02	31	0.97	5.30	38	-5.52[e]	5.25	5.37	28	-2.38[b]
Writing	2.58	0.00	31	0.01	5.13	39	-2.12[b]	1.93	4.80	30	-0.52
Grammar	7.61	8.92	28	-0.42	8.88	38	-3.62[e]	1.33	8.52	30	-2.74[c]

[a] <.10 [b] <.05 [c] <.01 [d] <.005 [e] <.001

TABLE VIII: SUMMARY OF COMPARISONS

A: THIRD-SEMESTER COURSE

	IExA			IExB		
	Pretest	Posttest	Gain	Pretest	Posttest	Gain
Listening	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Speaking	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Reading	N.S.	N.S.	less (<.10)	N.S.	higher (<.10)	N.S.
Writing	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Grammar	N.S.	N.S.	LESS (<.01)	N.S.	N.S.	LESS (<.02)

B: FOURTH-SEMESTER COURSE

	IIExA			IIExB		
	Pretest	Posttest	Gain	Pretest	Posttest	Gain
Listening	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	HIGHER (<.02)	N.S.	LESS (<.005)
Speaking	HIGHER (<.05)	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	less (<.10)
Reading	N.S.	lower (<.10)	LESS (<.001)	higher (<.10)	N.S.	LESS (<.05)
Writing	N.S.	N.S.	LESS (<.05)	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Grammar	N.S.	lower (<.10)	LESS (<.001)	N.S.	N.S.	LESS (<.01)

TABLE IX: PRETEST SCORES AND PREVIOUS GRADE
UPPER AND LOWER 30%

A: THIRD-SEMESTER COURSE

	IC			IExA				IExB			
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	t	Mean	S.D.	N	t
Listening	20.00	3.63	8	19.75	4.96	12	-0.12	16.50	4.81	10	-1.70[a]
	8.44	3.97	9	11.09	3.11	11	1.67	12.63	5.42	8	1.83[a]
Speaking	40.74	6.56	8	43.28	6.87	12	0.83	38.58	6.35	10	-0.71
	35.81	8.82	9	35.46	9.14	12	-0.09	28.66	4.28	8	-2.16[b]
Reading	18.71	4.68	7	19.55	18.43	11	0.14	16.60	7.52	10	-0.66
	5.25	4.23	8	8.83	4.82	12	1.71	4.25	3.29	8	-0.53
Writing	25.13	3.48	8	25.67	5.57	12	0.24	28.00	4.74	10	1.43
	13.67	4.47	9	12.83	2.76	12	-0.53	14.13	3.09	8	0.24
Grammar	27.50	9.24	8	32.58	9.16	12	1.21	31.60	6.96	10	1.07
	11.13	4.76	8	7.46	4.41	11	-1.73	10.86	4.02	7	-0.12
Prev.Grade	3.13	0.84	8	3.50	0.67	12	1.53	3.50	0.71	10	1.03
	2.11	0.78	9	2.08	0.29	12	-0.10	2.38	0.52	8	0.81

B: FOURTH-SEMESTER COURSE

	IIC			IIExA				IIExB			
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	t	Mean	S.D.	N	t
Listening	22.00	5.79	10	23.79	4.06	14	0.76	25.91	5.91	11	1.23
	14.20	5.43	10	15.50	4.72	12	0.60	15.67	4.61	9	0.63
Speaking	40.98	8.30	10	45.46	5.49	14	1.37	45.17	4.86	11	1.29
	31.88	12.14	10	36.85	8.80	13	1.14	31.83	7.77	9	-0.01
Reading	25.80	4.71	11	29.57	7.38	14	1.06	32.73	7.56	11	1.87[a]
	13.10	4.89	10	12.23	5.95	13	-0.37	12.13	2.70	8	-0.50
Writing	32.20	7.19	10	34.86	6.66	14	0.75	31.64	8.39	11	-0.13
	18.00	4.30	10	17.77	4.68	13	-0.12	13.75	4.92	8	-1.96[a]
Grammar	41.20	8.53	11	39.07	12.57	14	-0.35	46.73	13.03	11	0.86
	16.60	5.84	10	19.31	6.97	13	0.99	15.55	5.53	9	-0.44
Prev.Grade	3.80	0.45	11	3.36	0.63	14	-1.43	3.55	0.69	11	-0.75
	1.60	0.70	10	1.77	0.60	13	0.62	1.67	0.50	9	0.24

a < .10 b < .05

TABLE X: POSTTEST SCORES
UPPER AND LOWER 30%

A: THIRD-SEMESTER COURSE

	IC			IExA				IExB			
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	t	Mean	S.D.	N	t
Listening	25.00	4.78	8	22.17	4.93	12	-1.27	19.80	3.49	10	-2.67[b]
	13.88	4.09	8	14.92	3.50	12	0.61	13.71	4.11	7	-0.08
Speaking	45.71	2.32	8	46.38	3.04	12	0.53	42.85	7.85	10	-0.99
	37.62	7.61	9	38.40	7.21	12	0.24	33.99	5.36	8	-1.12
Reading	25.63	4.44	8	21.08	5.65	12	-1.91[a]	25.40	5.84	10	-0.09
	14.44	5.62	9	12.64	5.82	11	-0.70	14.00	6.14	8	-0.16
Writing	29.75	5.63	8	30.33	5.82	12	0.22	28.60	4.88	10	-0.46
	18.25	4.65	8	17.67	3.99	12	-0.30	17.71	3.86	11	-0.24
Grammar	39.50	12.78	8	33.58	11.33	12	-1.09	33.10	9.89	10	-1.20
	19.25	7.32	8	11.18	4.97	11	-2.87[b]	16.75	3.33	8	-0.88
(Course Grade)	(3.88	0.35	8	3.58	0.52	12	-1.39	3.20	0.63	10	-2.69[b])
	(1.89	0.78	9	1.83	0.39	12	-0.21	1.63	0.52	3	-0.81)

B: FOURTH-SEMESTER COURSE

	IIC			IIExA				IIExB			
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	t	Mean	S.D.	N	t
Listening	25.20	3.96	10	25.79	5.85	14	0.21	27.45	2.84	11	1.31
	18.67	6.08	9	20.31	3.61	13	0.73	15.78	7.58	9	-0.89
Speaking	46.26	3.95	10	46.17	6.00	14	-0.03	46.55	3.88	11	0.14
	37.99	8.83	10	39.99	9.07	13	0.51	32.18	8.69	9	-1.44
Reading	41.80	10.04	10	31.50	6.73	14	-2.59[b]	38.55	5.47	11	-0.68
	20.80	5.98	10	15.64	6.76	11	-1.85[a]	17.11	4.49	9	-1.51
Writing	35.00	3.39	10	33.14	7.29	14	-0.54	30.82	8.64	11	-1.39
	21.10	7.16	10	20.31	7.10	13	-0.26	18.67	3.94	9	-0.93
Grammar	56.00	10.58	10	42.64	16.73	14	-1.65	50.09	15.39	11	-0.77
	24.70	7.95	10	17.31	5.17	13	-2.70[b]	16.57	9.98	8	-1.87[a]
(Course Grade)	(3.40	0.55	10	3.23	0.73	14	-0.33	3.27	0.65	11	-0.38)
	(1.80	0.79	10	2.08	0.95	13	0.74	2.00	0.50	9	0.65)

[a] $<.10$ [b] $<.02$

TABLE XI: GAIN SCORES
UPPER AND LOWER 30%

A: THIRD-SEMESTER COURSE

	IC			IExA				IExB			
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	t	Mean	S.D.	N	t
Listening	5.00	3.34	8	2.42	2.61	12	-1.94[a]	3.30	3.95	10	-0.97
	4.89	2.52	9	4.64	2.69	11	-0.21	2.00	5.40	8	-1.39
Speaking	4.98	5.79	8	2.28	6.02	12	-0.99	4.27	5.69	10	-0.26
	1.81	5.79	9	2.92	7.17	12	0.38	5.30	4.95	8	1.33
Reading	8.00	7.96	7	7.45	4.91	11	-0.18	9.00	8.29	10	0.25
	8.56	4.28	9	4.33	5.05	12	-2.02[a]	9.89	6.79	8	0.47
Writing	4.00	4.93	7	5.17	5.69	12	0.46	1.60	5.70	10	-0.91
	3.56	3.25	9	4.83	3.38	12	0.87	3.75	3.96	8	0.11
Grammar	12.00	8.88	8	0.00	8.41	12	-3.06[c]	2.22	6.73	9	-2.58[b]
	6.71	7.43	7	5.58	4.17	12	-0.43	6.88	4.02	8	0.05

[a] $<.10$ [b] $<.025$ [c] $<.01$

B: FOURTH-SEMESTER COURSE

	IIC			IIExA				IIExB			
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	t	Mean	S.D.	N	t
Listening	1.75	4.57	9	2.00	4.80	14	0.09	1.55	5.63	11	-0.06
	4.70	5.50	10	5.00	4.20	12	0.15	0.11	4.96	9	-1.90[a]
Speaking	5.28	6.36	10	0.71	5.01	14	-1.63	1.29	5.43	11	-1.29
	6.13	12.63	10	3.06	4.79	13	-0.73	0.47	6.29	9	-1.26
Reading	16.00	7.68	10	1.93	5.94	14	-4.22[e]	5.50	6.31	10	-2.83[c]
	7.90	4.04	10	1.83	5.39	12	-2.93[d]	5.33	5.52	9	-1.16
Writing	2.80	10.09	10	-1.71	4.73	14	-0.96	0.64	3.70	11	-0.47
	3.10	3.78	10	2.54	5.75	13	-0.27	5.00	3.93	9	1.04
Grammar	19.33	14.84	9	3.57	7.36	14	-2.84[c]	2.60	9.48	10	-2.39[b]
	8.10	7.36	10	-2.58	9.35	12	-2.93[d]	0.11	10.37	9	-1.95[a]

[a] $<.10$ [b] $<.05$ [c] $<.02$ [d] $<.01$ [e] $<.001$

TABLE XII: SUMMARY OF COMPARISONS
UPPER AND LOWER 30%

A: THIRD-SEMESTER COURSE

	IExA			IExB		
	Pretest	Posttest	Gain	Pretest	Posttest	Gain
Listening	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	LOWER (<.02)	N.S.
	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	higher (<.10)	N.S.	N.S.
Speaking	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	LOWER (<.05)	N.S.	N.S.
Reading	N.S.	lower (<.10)	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
	N.S.	N.S.	less (<.10)	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Writing	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Grammar	N.S.	N.S.	LESS (<.01)	N.S.	N.S.	LESS (<.025)
	N.S.	LOWER (<.02)	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.

B: FOURTH-SEMESTER COURSE

	IIExA			IIExB		
	Pretest	Posttest	Gain	Pretest	Posttest	Gain
Listening	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	less (<.10)
Speaking	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Reading	N.S.	LOWER (<.02)	LESS (<.001)	higher (<.10)	N.S.	LESS (<.02)
	N.S.	lower (<.10)	LESS (<.01)	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Writing	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	lower (<.10)	N.S.	N.S.
Grammar	N.S.	N.S.	LESS (<.02)	N.S.	N.S.	LESS (<.05)
	N.S.	LOWER (<.02)	LESS (<.01)	N.S.	lower (<.10)	less (<.10)

TABLE XIII: POSTTEST INTERCORRELATIONS

A: THIRD-SEMESTER COURSE

	Speaking	Reading	Writing	Grammar	Course Grade	Prev. Grade**
Listening	0.64*	0.64*	0.57*	0.60*	0.78*	0.46*
	0.58*	0.48*	0.54*	0.58*	0.63*	0.59*
	0.69*	0.37	0.52*	0.30	0.62*	0.48*
	0.62*	0.32*	0.53*	0.51*	0.68*	0.51*
Speaking		0.57*	0.59*	0.58*	0.70*	0.60*
		0.30	0.43*	0.51*	0.62*	0.48*
		0.40	0.54*	0.25	0.55*	0.61*
		0.44*	0.49*	0.42*	0.60*	0.48*
Reading			0.65*	0.62*	0.74*	0.52*
			0.58*	0.61*	0.56*	0.52*
			0.37	0.53*	0.66*	0.40
			0.51*	0.58*	0.62*	0.47*
Writing				0.73*	0.83*	0.63*
				0.74*	0.90*	0.69*
				0.54*	0.69*	0.69*
				0.67*	0.81*	0.65*
Grammar					0.83*	0.68*
					0.75*	0.70*
					0.68*	0.43
					0.76*	0.58*

B: FOURTH-SEMESTER COURSE

Listening	0.53*	0.32	0.25	0.30	0.61*	0.25
	0.66*	0.47*	0.56*	0.41*	0.63*	0.46*
	0.73*	0.54*	0.44	0.63*	0.61*	0.67*
	0.65*	0.51*	0.43*	0.53*	0.44*	0.47*
Speaking		0.44*	0.63*	0.43	0.61*	0.27
		0.41*	0.55*	0.41*	0.63*	0.44*
		0.59*	0.47*	0.55*	0.33	0.63*
		0.44*	0.54*	0.44*	0.52*	0.46*
Reading			0.60*	0.76*	0.69*	0.61*
			0.70*	0.73*	0.59*	0.58*
			0.73*	0.80*	0.74*	0.81*
			0.64*	0.76*	0.61*	0.64*
Writing				0.79*	0.77*	0.60*
				0.82*	0.75*	0.65*
				0.77*	0.72*	0.73*
				0.77*	0.72*	0.63*
Grammar					0.78*	0.70*
					0.58*	0.65*
					0.73*	0.77*
					0.62*	0.66*

*<.01

** For the correlation of course grade and previous course grade, see Table XVI.

TABLE XIV: PRETEST AND POSTTEST CORRELATIONS

A: THIRD-SEMESTER COURSE

		PRETESTS				
		Listening	Speaking	Reading	Writing	Grammar
POSTTESTS	Listening	0.85*	0.52*	0.62*	0.71*	0.46*
		0.75*	0.58*	0.10	0.69*	0.49*
		0.42	0.61*	0.27	0.73*	0.43
		0.72*	0.57*	0.25	0.66*	0.44*
	Speaking	0.64*	0.66*	0.58*	0.64*	0.46*
		0.48*	0.61*	0.27	0.59*	0.43*
		0.47*	0.74*	0.37	0.60*	0.31
		0.49*	0.68*	0.35*	0.55*	0.37*
	Reading	0.60*	0.38	0.79*	0.64*	0.58*
		0.55*	0.50*	0.17	0.51*	0.56*
		0.31	0.33	0.61*	0.56*	0.55*
		0.47*	0.31*	0.36*	0.57*	0.52*
	Writing	0.50*	0.27	0.52*	0.78*	0.71*
		0.51*	0.36	0.09	0.79*	0.68*
		0.27	0.66*	0.39	0.78*	0.60*
		0.46*	0.40*	0.24	0.78*	0.66*
	Grammar	0.50*	0.31	0.58*	0.74*	0.82*
		0.66*	0.34	0.34	0.69*	0.81*
		0.19	0.23	0.34	0.59*	0.85*
		0.48*	0.27*	0.35*	0.66*	0.78*

B: FOURTH-SEMESTER COURSE

		PRETESTS				
	Listening	0.58*	0.30	0.11	0.22	0.51*
		0.67*	0.53*	0.52*	0.51*	0.46*
		0.76*	0.55*	0.67*	0.59*	0.53*
		0.66*	0.47*	0.47*	0.45*	0.49*
POSTTESTS	Speaking	0.38	0.46*	0.37	0.46*	0.47*
		0.79*	0.51*	0.50*	0.38	0.33
		0.75*	0.76*	0.55*	0.60*	0.55*
		0.53*	0.67*	0.48*	0.48*	0.44*
	Reading	0.16	0.17	0.65*	0.38	0.62*
		0.72*	0.61*	0.80*	0.68*	0.50*
		0.61*	0.60*	0.90*	0.68*	0.83*
		0.49*	0.38*	0.74*	0.53*	0.64*
	Writing	0.16	0.21	0.43	0.75*	0.63*
		0.59*	0.63*	0.64*	0.82*	0.69*
		0.55*	0.49*	0.69*	0.85*	0.71*
		0.41*	0.43*	0.58*	0.81*	0.66*
	Grammar	0.23	0.14	0.49*	0.55*	0.77*
		0.75*	0.52*	0.72*	0.75*	0.82*
		0.73*	0.56*	0.84*	0.84*	0.87*
		0.56*	0.37*	0.67*	0.70*	0.80*

*<.01

TABLE XV: COMPARISON OF ATTITUDES, STUDY HOURS, ETC.

A: THIRD-SEMESTER COURSE

	IC			IExA				IExB			
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	t	Mean	S.D.	N	t
Motivation	2.68	1.01	31	2.83	0.97	36	0.64	2.96	1.26	28	0.97
Attitude	3.65	0.95	31	3.50	0.94	36	-0.63	3.32	1.30	28	-1.08
Attendance	1.29	1.66	31	3.28	0.91	36	5.94[d]	2.50	1.11	28	3.33[c]
Study Hours	6.07	3.15	29	6.72	3.05	32	0.82	7.44	2.97	25	1.64
Course Grade	2.65	0.95	31	2.44	0.91	36	-0.88	2.46	0.84	28	-0.77

B: FOURTH-SEMESTER COURSE

	IIC			IIExA				IIExB			
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	t	Mean	S.D.	N	t
Motivation	2.71	1.04	31	2.75	0.93	40	0.17	2.87	1.23	31	0.56
Attitude	3.16	1.19	31	4.15	1.10	40	3.63[d]	3.23	1.09	31	0.22
Attendance	1.42	1.57	31	1.48	1.72	40	0.14	2.16	1.13	31	2.14[b]
Study Hours	7.11	3.00	28	5.03	1.58	39	-3.35[c]	7.30	2.97	30	0.25
Course Grade	2.29	0.78	31	2.68	0.92	40	1.87[a]	2.65	0.84	31	1.72[a]

[a] $< .10$ [b] $< .05$ [c] $< .005$ [d] $< .001$

TABLE XVI: INTERCORRELATIONS OF MOTIVATION, ATTITUDE, STUDY TIME, ETC.

A: THIRD-SEMESTER COURSE

	Attitude	Attend'ce	Study Hrs.	Course Grade	Prev. Grade
Motivation	0.57*	0.12	0.02	0.74*	0.56*
	0.50*	0.44*	-0.01	0.44*	0.26
	0.34	-0.07	0.08	0.27	0.19
	0.43*	0.15	0.05	0.45*	0.34*
Attitude		0.09	-0.11	0.70*	0.41
		0.33	0.07	0.50*	0.28
		-0.01	0.11	0.30	0.10
		0.05	0.01	0.49*	0.22
Attendance			-0.04	0.15	-0.05
			0.35	0.29	0.30
			0.11	0.30	0.04
			0.14	0.13	0.13
Study Hours				-0.06	0.04
				0.03	-0.04
				0.11	0.26
				-0.01	0.10
Course Grade					0.70*
					0.68*
					0.63*
					0.64*

B: FOURTH-SEMESTER COURSE

Motivation	0.63*	-0.09	0.08	0.60*	0.35
	0.14	0.14	0.08	0.51*	0.36
	0.35	0.35	0.21	0.47*	0.59*
	0.33*	0.13	0.13	0.51*	0.44*
Attitude		0.34	0.34	0.45*	0.07
		0.25	0.16	0.25	-0.03
		0.24	0.20	0.27	0.07
		0.21	0.05	0.33*	0.04
Attendance			0.42	-0.08	-0.31
			0.03	-0.16	0.01
			0.13	0.49*	0.14
			0.21	0.03	-0.03
Study Hours				-0.20	-0.25
				0.19	0.05
				0.09	0.17
				-0.02	-0.01
Course Grade					0.61*
					0.61*
					0.69*
					0.64*

*<.01

TABLE XVII: CORRELATIONS OF MOTIVATION AND OTHER FACTORS WITH POSTTEST AND GAIN SCORES

A: THIRD-SEMESTER COURSE

	POSTTESTS					GAIN SCORES				
	Listen.	Speak.	Read.	Writing	Grammar	Listen.	Speak.	Read.	Writing	Grammar
Motivation	0.57*	0.45*	0.63*	0.65*	0.70*	0.34	0.15	0.25	0.22	0.63*
	0.26	0.40	0.34	0.40	0.35	-0.13	0.10	0.33	0.01	-0.15
	0.49*	0.54*	0.18	0.31	-0.06	0.18	0.17	0.38	0.21	0.20
	0.42*	0.42*	0.36*	0.43*	0.31*	0.14	0.11	0.32*	0.13	0.18
Attitude	0.52*	0.53*	0.58*	0.71*	0.64*	0.22	0.42*	0.21	0.18	0.53*
	0.36	0.14	0.17	0.51*	0.28	0.13	-0.02	0.22	0.08	-0.08
	0.25	0.14	0.34	0.27	0.02	0.20	0.06	0.11	0.32	0.05
	0.37*	0.25	0.31*	0.46*	0.29*	0.20	0.12	0.13	0.21	0.18
Attendance	0.16	0.18	0.41	0.24	-0.01	-0.10	-0.15	0.48	0.12	-0.16
	0.30	0.25	0.05	0.24	0.23	-0.10	-0.05	0.13	0.15	-0.01
	0.02	-0.06	0.06	0.14	-0.04	0.10	-0.53*	0.11	0.11	-0.22
	0.12	0.13	0.09	0.16	-0.04	-0.01	-0.20	0.13	0.18	-0.28*
Study Hours	0.07	-0.05	-0.14	0.03	-0.33	-0.13	-0.20	-0.13	0.07	-0.15
	-0.20	0.01	-0.22	0.02	-0.14	0.25	0.09	-0.07	0.18	-0.01
	-0.09	-0.11	-0.19	0.08	-0.05	0.33	0.08	-0.14	0.42	0.24
	-0.10	-0.06	-0.15	0.03	0.20	0.10	-0.01	-0.09	0.22	-0.03

*<.01

B: FOURTH-SEMESTER COURSE

	POSTTESTS					GAIN SCORES				
	Listen.	Speak.	Read.	Writing	Grammar	Listen.	Speak.	Read.	Writing	Grammar
Motivation	0.29	0.48	0.70*	0.65*	0.74*	0.15	0.45*	0.61*	0.56*	0.70*
	0.50*	0.54*	0.52*	0.48*	0.52*	-0.06	0.10	0.25	0.26	0.45*
	0.46*	0.66*	0.60*	0.55*	0.49*	-0.04	0.21	0.23	0.02	0.38
	0.56*	0.42*	0.60*	0.53*	0.55*	-0.01	0.25	0.32*	0.26*	0.43*
Attitude	0.07	0.24	0.34	0.39	0.34	0.15	0.45*	0.61*	0.56*	0.70*
	0.50*	0.54*	0.52*	0.48*	0.52*	-0.06	0.10	0.25	0.26	0.45*
	0.46*	0.66*	0.60*	0.55*	0.49*	-0.04	0.21	0.23	0.02	0.38
	0.42*	0.56*	0.60*	0.53*	0.55*	-0.01	0.25*	0.32*	0.26*	0.43*
Attendance	-0.23	-0.09	-0.29	-0.07	-0.22	0.20	0.26	-0.24	0.01	0.08
	0.12	-0.01	-0.04	-0.16	-0.05	0.39	0.45	-0.12	0.08	-0.15
	0.13	-0.12	0.26	0.33	0.27	0.05	0.05	0.08	0.30	0.38
	0.01	-0.07	-0.01	-0.05	-0.01	0.19	0.18	-0.12	0.11	0.03
Study Hours	-0.28	-0.20	-0.19	-0.28	-0.26	0.20	0.23	-0.17	0.22	0.11
	0.25	0.06	0.18	0.16	0.30	-0.05	0.07	-0.02	0.12	0.12
	0.38	-0.07	0.15	-0.08	0.06	0.40	0.08	-0.19	-0.21	0.06
	0.09	-0.11	0.11	-0.09	0.08	0.13	0.15	-0.12	0.11	0.03

*<.01

TABLE XVIII: TEACHER RATING BY STUDENTS

A: THIRD-SEMESTER COURSE

	IC vs. IExAB				IExA vs. ICExB				IExB vs. ICExA			
Variables	Mean	S.D.	N	t	Mean	S.D.	N	t	Mean	S.D.	N	t
1	3.27	0.69	30	0.53	3.50	0.61	36	3.10[e]	2.80	0.79	28	-3.85[f]
	3.18	0.78	64		3.03	0.77	58		3.39	0.65	66	
2	3.04	0.79	28	0.90	3.33	0.70	31	1.60	3.06	0.81	28	-0.71
	3.19	0.77	59		3.05	0.80	56		3.19	0.75	59	
3	3.17	0.79	30	-1.17	3.58	0.73	36	2.37[c]	3.16	1.00	28	-1.25
	3.39	0.89	64		3.16	0.90	58		3.39	0.78	66	
4	2.50	0.63	30	-1.42	3.19	0.79	36	5.41[f]	2.23	0.73	28	-3.78[f]
	2.76	0.90	64		2.37	0.69	58		2.88	0.80	66	
5	3.07	0.88	29	0.12	3.34	0.80	35	2.49[c]	2.71	0.90	28	-2.69[d]
	3.05	0.90	63		2.88	0.90	57		3.22	0.85	64	
6	3.00	0.64	30	-0.64	3.17	0.66	35	1.18	3.00	0.73	25	-0.59
	3.10	0.70	60		3.00	0.68	55		3.09	0.66	65	
7	3.23	0.73	30	-0.61	3.33	0.72	36	0.36	3.32	0.70	28	0.22
	3.33	0.71	64		3.28	0.71	58		3.29	0.72	66	
8	2.91	0.87	22	-0.13	3.15	0.74	34	2.06[a]	2.68	0.82	26	-2.02[b]
	2.94	0.81	60		=.78	0.84	48		3.05	0.80	56	
9	3.20	0.81	30	-1.33	3.61	0.65	36	2.71[d]	3.19	0.75	28	-1.42
	3.42	0.72	64		3.20	0.77	58		3.42	0.75	66	
10	2.28	0.77	22	-2.04[a]	3.17	0.89	35	5.53[f]	2.09	0.67	23	-2.01[b]
	2.74	0.97	58		2.18	0.72	45		2.82	0.95	57	

[a] $< .05$ [b] $< .025$ [c] $< .02$ [d] $< .01$ [e] $< .005$ [f] $< .001$

B: FOURTH-SEMESTER COURSE

Variable	IIC vs. IIExAB				IIExA vs. IICExB				IIExB vs. IICExA			
	Mean	S.D.	N	t	Mean	S.D.	N	t	Mean	S.D.	N	t
1	3.19	0.90	30	0.52	3.51	0.59	40	4.28[e]	2.58	0.99	31	-4.22[e]
	3.09	0.92	71		2.87	0.99	61		3.37	0.75	70	
2	2.84	0.88	30	-2.29[b]	3.57	0.67	39	4.60[e]	2.88	0.98	27	-2.04[a]
	3.27	0.88	66		2.86	0.92	57		3.26	0.85	69	
3	3.06	0.99	31	-0.68	3.79	0.41	40	7.19[e]	2.50	1.06	31	-4.90[e]
	3.20	1.00	71		2.77	1.06	62		3.47	0.81	71	
4	2.53	0.92	30	-3.03[d]	3.77	0.48	40	10.58[e]	2.32	0.77	29	-5.03[e]
	3.13	0.95	69		2.42	0.84	59		3.24	0.93	70	
5	2.73	0.98	28	-0.31	2.81	0.97	39	0.28	2.78	0.83	31	0.00
	2.79	0.90	70		2.76	0.90	59		2.78	0.97	67	
6	3.19	0.78	30	1.18	3.10	0.77	38	0.51	2.85	0.86	29	-1.65
	2.99	0.81	67		3.02	0.83	59		3.14	0.77	68	
7	3.13	0.83	30	-0.01	3.16	0.75	43	-0.37	3.08	0.91	31	-0.38
	3.13	0.82	71		3.10	0.86	68		3.15	0.78	70	
8	2.85	0.93	24	-2.22[b]	3.48	0.77	39	2.99[d]	3.03	0.94	24	-1.00
	3.30	0.87	63		2.95	0.93	48		3.24	0.88	63	
9	3.36	0.86	31	-0.89	3.95	0.95	40	6.57[e]	2.97	1.00	29	-3.88[e]
	3.52	0.84	69		3.16	0.21	60		3.70	0.65	71	
10	2.33	0.76	22	-5.08[e]	3.63	0.58	40	7.82[e]	2.67	0.76	19	-2.42[c]
	3.28	0.79	59		2.50	0.77	41		3.16	0.90	62	

[a] <.05 [b] <.025 [c] <.02 [d] <.005 [e] <.001

TABLE XIX: TEACHER RATING BY STUDENTS
SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TWO
TEACHERS OF THE SAME TRACK

A: THIRD-SEMESTER COURSE

	IC				IExA				IExB			
Variable	Mean	S.D.	N	t	Mean	S.D.	N	t	Mean	S.D.	N	t
5	2.53	0.74	15	-4.31[e]					2.18	0.53	13	-4.56[e]
	3.64	0.63	14						3.36	0.84	12	
7					2.87	0.74	15	-3.65[d]	3.06	0.75	14	-2.50[c]
					3.67	0.48	21		3.64	0.50	12	

B: FOURTH-SEMESTER COURSE

	IIC				IIExA				IIExB			
Variable	Mean	S.D.	N	t	Mean	S.D.	N	t	Mean	S.D.	N	t
1	3.67	0.49	14	3.38[d]								
	2.76	0.97	16									
3	3.53	0.74	14	2.72[b]								
	2.67	1.03	16									
5	2.17	0.72	12	-2.90[c]								
	3.11	0.96	17									
6	2.40	0.70	14	-2.07[a]								
	3.13	0.96	16									
7	3.93	0.26	14	4.70[e]								
	2.89	0.90	16									
9									2.65	0.99	17	-2.39[b]
									3.43	0.85	11	
10									2.25	0.45	11	-3.16[c]
									3.08	0.79	12	

[a] < .05 [b] < .02 [c] < .01 [d] < .005 [e] < .001

TABLE XX: INTERCORRELATIONS OF TEACHER RATING ITEMS

A: THIRD-SEMESTER COURSE

Variables	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	0.60*	0.44*	0.32	0.38	0.44*	0.49*	0.03	0.52*	-0.06
	0.54*	0.22	0.51*	0.29	0.47*	0.33	0.31	0.44*	0.33
	0.38	0.46	0.37	-0.03	0.45	0.12	0.11	0.51*	0.11
2		0.63*	0.26	0.34	0.47*	0.49*	-0.07	0.62*	0.16
		0.21	0.45*	0.39	0.51*	0.41	0.20	0.42*	0.32
		0.48*	0.32	0.12	0.46	0.20	0.48*	0.20	-0.10
3			0.58*	0.29	0.27	0.29	0.10	0.49*	0.47*
			0.69*	0.34	0.33	0.22	0.22	0.49*	0.51*
			0.46	-0.09	0.06	0.16	0.42	0.48	0.26
4				0.07	0.17	0.34	0.66*	0.20	0.36
				0.35	0.34	0.34	0.21	0.44*	0.32
				0.11	0.29	0.31	0.28	0.41	0.33
5					0.43	0.26	0.22	0.54*	0.38
					0.67*	0.35	0.27	0.26	0.27
					0.40	0.41	0.36	-0.26	0.29
6						0.52*	-0.07	0.53*	0.35
						0.25	0.31	0.43	0.27
						0.35	0.20	0.07	0.11
7							0.18	0.68*	0.25
							0.25	0.23	0.23
							0.40	-0.06	0.03
8								0.19	0.52*
								0.39	0.44*
								0.23	0.22
9									0.38
									0.53*
									0.37

* .01

B: FOURTH-SEMESTER COURSE

Variables	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	0.66*	0.55*	0.58*	0.20	0.56*	0.46*	0.06	0.50*	0.69*
	0.47*	0.35	0.09	0.26	0.49*	0.29	-0.08	0.19	0.22
	0.72*	0.77*	0.47*	0.20	0.49*	0.51*	0.34	0.64*	0.50
2		0.63*	0.55*	0.47*	0.51*	0.56*	0.50*	0.20	0.73*
		0.28	0.13	0.39*	0.53*	0.51*	0.37	0.19	0.35
		0.50*	0.40	0.41	0.56*	0.57*	0.20	0.42	0.32
3			0.72*	0.33	0.19	0.30	0.28	0.56*	0.60*
			0.55*	0.26	0.15	0.04	0.25	0.16	0.47*
			0.65*	0.07	0.25	0.37	0.22	0.51*	0.65*
4				0.42	0.39	0.38	0.42	0.62*	0.53*
				0.16	0.01	-0.02	0.18	0.12	0.54*
				0.17	0.45	0.16	0.39	0.33	0.61*
5					0.14	0.54*	0.42	0.02	0.36
					0.50*	0.47*	0.21	0.19	0.17
					0.42	0.52*	0.29	0.18	0.05
6						0.43	0.31	0.37	0.47
						0.45*	0.07	0.18	0.09
						0.47*	0.23	0.17	0.12
7							0.43	0.16	0.46
							0.28	0.05	0.09
							0.36	0.48*	0.39
8								0.15	0.33
								0.14	0.39
								0.48*	0.39
9									0.18
									0.05
									0.40

*<.01

TABLE XXI: ASPECTS OF THE COURSE LIKED MOST OR LEAST

Aspect		IC	IExA	IExB	IIC	IIExA	IIExB
Textbooks	M*	29	20	56	36	55	47
	L*	11	45	20	14	33	35
Magazines	M		1			20	11
	L		2			5	4
Grammar Study	M	0	1	1	0	0	0
	L	5	5	6	11	1	5
Type of Tests	M	3	2	1	1	1	3
	L	1	5	6	0	4	3
Course-wide Exams	M	0	0		0	0	
	L	4	2		4	4	
Homework	M	0	0		0	0	0
	L	2	3		2	2	3
Reading Assingment	M		6		17	0	20
	L		1		2	2	1
Translations	M	1		0			0
	L	0		2			1
Speaking, Speeches	M	8	6	1	2	17	0
	L	1	0	2	1	7	3
Essays and Compositions	M	3	4	5	1	5	3
	L	1	0	1	0	4	0
Literary Discussions	M	4		7	9		7
	L	0		0	2		10
Records, songs	M				1	3	
	L				0	0	
Movies and Slides	M	1	5	1	1	2	2
	L	0	0	0	0	0	0
Skits, Games	M		7			13	
	L		0			0	
Guest Lecturers	M		4			11	
	L		0			0	
Classroom Atmosphere	M		9			8	1
	L		0			0	0
Outside Activities	M		8			19	
	L		0			1	
Instructor	M		2	1	1		0
	L		0	3	1		1
Others	M	2	1	0	1	6	8
	L	1	1	1	3	2	2

*M and L refer to the aspects liked MOST and the aspects liked LEAST

TABLE XXII: SUGGESTIONS BY STUDENTS AND TEACHERS*

Item		IC	IExA	IExB	IIC	IIExA	IIExB
Assignments	M**			2	0	6	0
	L**			0	3	2	(1)2
Oral-Aural Work	M	(2)2	5	2	(1)2	1	1
	L	1	0	0	0	0	(1)0
Reading	M	2	1		1	2	0
	L	1	1		0	1	1
Writing	M		2	0	1		2
	L		1	(1)1	0		(1)0
Grammar Review	M	1	2	1	0	2	2
	L	(1)0	0	1	(1)1	0	0
No. of Quizzes	M		(1)1				
	L		(1)				
Magazines	M***	1		1		2	(2)2
Slides, Movies	M		1	1			
Translations	M				(1)		
Sight Reading	M			(1)			(1)
Discussions on Culture, Lit.	M	2	1	2	1		1
Variety of Activities	M				2		
Change Texts****		(1)2	(2)11		2	(1)5	(1)9
Lab. Tapes		1			1	4	
Smaller Class						10	
Set grades as Prerequisite						1	
Realia Supply				(1)			(1)
Outside Activities				(1)			
Personal Comments to Teachers		2			1	1	

*Teachers' comments are put in parentheses; students' comments are not.

**M stands for MORE, L for LESS.

***No suggestions for LESS were found from here on.

****M or L does not apply to the items from here to the end.

NOTES

[1]For a description of the various language teaching objectives and methods, see: Robert L. Politzer, Teaching French: An Introduction to Applied Linguistics (Boston: Blaisdell Company, 1965), pp. 1-48, and Wilga Rivers, Teaching Foreign Language Skills (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1968), pp. 1-55.

[2]Algernon Coleman, The Teaching of Modern Foreign Languages in the United States (New York: MacMillan Company, 1929). For a concise description of the reading-oriented method, see W. Rivers, op. cit., pp. 22-24.

[3]The purpose of outside reading is extensive rather than intensive reading. Students are not required to look up every work and expression as they presumably do for the texts used in class. They read the material on their own with occasional help from their instructors. Its content, background, and authors are discussed by the instructors. Student comprehension of the book is evaluated twice during the term.

[4]Ministère de l'Education Nationale, Le Français Fondamental (I^{er} Degré), (Paris: Publication de l'Institut Pédagogique, 1959).

[5]The procedure for the grading of the oral test was based on the description of similiar tests by: Paul Pimsleur, "The French Speaking Proficiency Test," International Journal of American Linguistics, XXVIII, No. 1, Pt. 2 (1962), 105-114, MLA-Cooperative Foreign Language Tests: Directions for Administering and Scoring (Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1963), and M.P. Hagiwara and Robert L. Politzer, Continuons à Parler: The Instructor's Manual (Boston: Blaisdell Company, 1967).

[6]This figure was arrived at by making a distribution of the differences between the mean total scores and the scores issued by the three judges and computing the standard deviation. A standard error of 2.1 means that the true score should be regarded as lying ±2.1 of a given score. Thus a score of 30 would indicate that the true score lies between 27.9 and 32.1.

[7]Dehydrated sentences refer to the type of writing exercise in which the student supplies the "grammar" to a given series of lexical items by adding verb tenses, adjective agreement, pronouns, etc. See: William G. Moulton et al., "The Teaching of Reading", in Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

Reports of the Working Committees, ed. Thomas E. Bird (Mensha, Wisconsin: George Banta Company, 1967), pp. 21-24.

[8]The standard deviation of a set of scores reveals the degree of variability of the indiviuual scores in relation to the mean (average) score. It is the square root of the mean squared deviation of all the scores from the group. Large standard deviation indicates greatly dispersed or varied scores from the group, while a small standard deviation implies more compactly distributed scores.

[9]*t* value is a standard statistical device for the measurement of the significance of a finding. It expressed the difference between two comparable statistics. In the present study, the pooled variance estimate and separate variance estimate give the *t* value of the data. The use of one or the other was determined by the F value (omitted from the tables) which tests whether or not the population standard deviations are equal. The greater the F, the more likely they are not equal. If F was less than that required for .05, pooled variance rather than separate variance estimate was used.

The presence or absence of statistical significance is determintd by the *p*, or probability. The probability of an occurance is expressed by a decimal fraction which refers to the ratio of actual occurrences to the likelihood of occurrences. At .05 level, there is one possibility out of twenty that the particular statistic is due to chance occurrence and cannot be repeated. At .01 level, there is one chance out of one hundred that the finding is due to a chance element. The smaller the *p*, the more statistically significant the finding. The .10 level is generally considered statistically non-significant. It can, however, point out the general direction or tendency. In our study, significance at .10 is mentioned as "near-significant" or "approaching significance", and should not be confused with other, more significant levels such as .05, .01, etc.

[10]Zero means no correlation and 1.00 a perfect correlation. A correlation coefficient depends on the sample size because different-sized coefficients are used to establish a significant relationship in various groups and variables. The number of pairs used in the computation of correlation coefficients of all the variables has been omitted from the matrices since it varied, depending on the variables, and would have made the tables more difficult to read.

[11]The clustering of listening and speaking on one hand and that of reading and writing on the other were also reported in the Colorado Experiment on the effects of two language teaching methods. See: George A.C. Scherer and Michael Wertheimer, A Psycholinguistic Experiment in Foreign-Language Teaching (New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1964), pp. 174, 178, 180 and 181.

[12]It would have been probably more useful to ask questions in such a way that the so-called integrative and instrumental types of motivation was more clearly differentiated. Multiple-choice items with appropriate rating scales may have shown significant differences in the level of motivation among the three tracks. See G. Scherer and M. Wetheimer, op. cit., pp. 157-163 and 227-241. In the Colorado Experiment, motivation indices showed no significant differences between the two groups. In another study concerning two instructional methods, no significant differences in motivation were found. See: Kenneth D. Chastan and Frank J. Woerdehoff, "A Methodological Study Comparing the Audio-Lingual Habit Theory and the Cognitive Code-Learning Theory", Modern Language Journal, LII, No. 5 (May, 1968), 268-279.

[13]The possibility of establishing the "observable behavioral categories" of effective teaching activities are discussed by: Robert L. Politzer, "Toward a Practice-Oriented Program for the Training and Evaluation of Foreign Language Teachers", Modern Language Journal, L (1966), 251-255.

[14]Several years ago, both Paris-Match and L'Express were used with success in the fourth-semester course. The use of magazines was discontinued because of the problem of obtaining a sufficient number of copies in time. In the present study, the experimental sections had considerable difficulty in ordering and receiving the planned number of copies.

[15]Deliberately controversial conversation topics are not necessarily effective in teaching speaking, unless some groundwork in structural and lexical study has been laid through more familiar topics. See: George Klin, "Content and Methods in Conversation Courses," French Review, XLIII, No. 4 (March, 1970), 641-647.